

AP

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

*The*

OCT 30 1953

PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM

# *London Quarterly*

&

# *Holborn Review*

LITERATURE · HISTORY · SOCIOLOGY  
RELIGION · THEOLOGY · PHILOSOPHY  
EDITOR · J. ALAN KAY, M.A., PH.D.

---

## *Contributors Include*

JOHN C. BOWMER, M.A., B.D.  
HENRY R. CHILLINGWORTH, M.A.  
THOMAS J. FOINETTE, B.D.  
CHARLES GIMBLETT, M.A.  
T. E. JESSOP, O.B.E., M.C., M.A., LITT.D.  
W. S. HANDLEY JONES  
JOHN J. LEWIS, M.A., B.D.  
THOMAS D. MEADLEY, B.A., B.D.  
FREDERICK PILKINGTON  
SETON POLLOCK  
PERCY SCOTT, B.D., D.TH.  
T. B. SHEPHERD, M.A., PH.D.  
C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.

*London*

THE EPWORTH PRESS

(FRANK H. CUMBERS)

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

---

OCTOBER 1953 · PRICE FOUR SHILLINGS NET

## THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

### Contents

Editorial Comments: by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	241	The Laureate of Empire by W. S. Handley Jones	284
Methodism and the Catholic Revival by Thomas J. Foinette, B.D.	246	Collected Poems by Dylan Thomas by T. B. Shepherd, M.A., PH.D.	290
John Wesley and Ireland by John C. Bowmer, M.A., B.D.	252	The Teaching of Pseudo Phocylides by John J. Lewis, M.A., B.D.	295
An Annotation to Wesley's Journal by Frederick Pilkington	263	The Crux—A Study in the Art of Wisdom by Seton Pollock	299
The Present-day Prophet by T. E. Jessop, O.B.E., M.C., M.A., LITT.D.	271	Time and the Divine Artist by Charles Gimblett, M.A.	302
Our Protestant Heritage by Henry R. Chillingworth, M.A.	275	The Bible Doctrine of Sin by Percy Scott, B.D., D.TH.	304
The Second Attack on the English Stage by Thomas D. Meadley, B.A., B.D.	279	Recent Literature Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	306
		From My New Shelf By C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	315



## This is the HOME Service!

To provide a Home for neglected and homeless boys and girls was the great ideal in the heart and mind of Dr. Stephenson when he founded the Children's Home in 1869. It remains the chief objective of its policy, for though social conditions have improved, there are still children who are deprived of a real home-life, with all that means in sorrow and tragedy.

So long as the need continues the National Children's Home will do its utmost to help these little people. Please help us to carry on.

## NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

Chief Offices :

HIGHBURY PARK, LONDON, N.5.



T

A

li

de

ev

cl

se

sp

pr

H

U

te

gi

m

of

al

th

to

an

int

ma

bo

th

tin

qu

be

wa

str

wi



## Editorial Comments

### THE WRITING OF A PREFACE

A PREFACE is a kind of porch through which to enter the main building. It may be enlarged into a hall that will contain a multitude or reduced to a little roof that will suffice to keep the rain off the single visitor who waits at the door. Bernard Shaw liked to make the porch almost as large as the building and even more weighty, but one who claimed to be greater than Shakespeare had clearly dispensed with the criteria of the ordinary man. Thackeray had a better sense of proportion; his preface to *Vanity Fair* is no more than a short introductory speech by the Manager of the Performance, and after a page and a half, with 'a profound bow to his patrons, the Manager retires, and the curtain rises'.

It is often fitting for an author to use his preface to acknowledge his indebtedness. He may wish to thank Dr A, Professor B, Messrs X, Y, Z, his wife, his dog, Old Uncle Tom Cobbleigh and all. He may say, like J. M. Synge, that his chief indebtedness is to a chink in the floor that let him hear what was being said by the servant girls in the kitchen. He may declare that he has sucked from so many flowers in so many fields that he is quite unable to say where any particular drop of his pound of honey has come from. Or he may find it necessary to state that his books are all his own unaided work. There were some critics who said that Bunyan was not the author of *Pilgrim's Progress*, and so when he came to write *The Holy War* he took occasion to say about the earlier book that

*It came from mine own heart, so to my head,  
And thence into my fingers trickled;  
Then to my pen, from whence immediately  
On paper I did dribble it daintily;*

and of the later one that it came from the same heart and head,

*For none in all the world, without a lie,  
Can say that this is mine, excepting I.*

Some books need to be preceded by instructions for their use: that they are intended to be read in public—or in private, rapidly—or slowly, that some chapters may be skipped—or that they should be taken in small doses and not the whole bottleful at once. So Isaac Watts instructs those who would use his psalms that they should be taken faster than congregations usually sing, not dwelling a long time on every single note, 'which disgraces the music and puts the congregation quite out of breath'. P. G. Wodehouse tells us that his *Jeeves Omnibus Book* may be used as a paper-weight or a missile, and assures us that if it is placed upon the waist-line and jerked up and down each morning, 'it will reduce embonpoint and strengthen the abdominal muscles'. Herrick fears his book's misuse, and hopes it will find a patron who is friendly,

*Lest, rapt from hence, I see thee lie  
Torn for the use of pastery;  
Or see thy injur'd leaves serve well  
To make loose gowns for mackerel;  
Or see the grocers in a trice  
Make hoods of thee to serve out spice.*

Some books are the better for a preface which explains quite straightforwardly what they are at. The preface to the *Prayer Book* of 1549 begins, 'There was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted', and goes on to say that for many years past the original 'godly and decent order' of the Common Prayers of the Church has been 'altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories, and legends, with multitude of responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals', that much scripture has been omitted, that the people have not been able to understand the Latin tongue in which the service was written, that the rules called the Pie were so difficult 'that many times there was more business to find out what should be read than to read it when it was found out', and that the *Prayer Book* has been devised to redress these inconveniences.

Sometimes the contents of a book need defence rather than explanation. The reader may think the author has chosen a subject that is unfitting, or has treated it in a manner that is unsuitable. Milton prefaces *Samson Agonistes* with a defence of Tragedy, so as to vindicate it 'from the small esteem, or rather infamy, which in the account of many it undergoes at this day'. And Thomas Hardy in the later editions of *Tess* found it necessary to defend not only the adjective in his sub-title and his phrase about the Immortals, but the introduction into his story of 'such vulgar articles as the Devil's pitchfork, a lodging-house carving-knife, and a shame-bought parasol', and to profess himself thankful for the innate gentility of that critic who had excused him by saying 'he does but give us of his best'.

Sometimes it is the style that has to be justified. Wordsworth not only defends his commonplace subjects, but his decision to write about them in 'a selection of language really used by men' instead of in the high-flown poetic diction which was customary in his time. It is indeed always a 'mean style' that an author finds in need of justification; if he uses an elaborate one, he always thinks it can be assumed that it is good. Chaucer writing *A Treatise on the Astrolabe* for 'lyte Lowys my sone' carefully explains that it is written in 'naked wordes in Englysshe, for Latyn canst thou yit but small, my litel sone', and meekly prays 'every discret persone that redith or herith this litel tretys to have my rude endityng for excused'. John Cennick, when he published his *Sacred Hymns for the Children of God in the days of their Pilgrimage* thought it necessary to comment on their style though he was too wise to apologize for it: 'I wou'd not have any who read these Hymns look to find either good Poetry or fine Language therein, for indeed there is none; neither is there Wisdom of Words to please the Ears of the curious, but only the simple Breathings of the Soul's seeking after Jesus, as Employment for such as wou'd make Melody in their Hearts to the LORD, and be merry in their Way to the Rest which remaineth for the People of GOD.'

An author may find a need to defend, not his matter or his style, but himself. Boswell feared that his attempt to write the life of Johnson might be reckoned in

him 'a presumptuous task', and he therefore explained the opportunities he had had of collecting and preserving his material; and Francois de Sales assured his 'dear reader' that although he wrote of the devout life without himself being devout, yet his desire to become so was a qualification for writing. From this it is easy to drop into protesting that one is really quite unfit to write the book that follows, and indeed one would never have done so but for this reason and that. But this kind of thing has been said so often that the reader never knows whether it proceeds from false modesty or real incompetence.

Where there is no need to do more, the author may simply ask for a kind reception. In the days of patrons he wrote a dedicatory letter, and surely the most remarkable of these is the one to be found at the beginning of the *Authorized Version*. It will always be reckoned a miracle that our translation of the Bible was produced by a committee, but the wonder of the miracle is enhanced by the fact that it was a committee whose ordinary style was that of the dedication. After a couple of sentences of introduction to 'The Most High and Mighty Prince James', the epistle continues: 'For whereas it was the expectation of many, who wished not well unto our *Sion*, that upon the setting of that bright *Occidental Star*, Queen *Elizabeth* of most happy memory, some thick and palpable clouds of darkness would so have overshadowed this Land, that men should have been in doubt which way they were to walk; . . . the appearance of Your Majesty, as of the *Sun* in his strength, instantly dispelled those supposed and surmised mists, and gave unto all that were well affected exceeding cause of comfort.' And after a good deal more of this kind of stuff, the committee ask that their work 'may receive approbation and patronage from so learned and judicious a Prince as Your Highness is, whose allowance and acceptance of our labours shall more honour and encourage us, than all the calumniations and hard interpretations of other men shall dismay us'.

What the author should not do is to make excuses. It is better even to claim what Swift calls 'the common privilege of a writer', 'that where I am not understood it shall be concluded that something very useful and profound is couched underneath'. True we can forgive Izaak Walton when he says he intended to correct his life of Mr Herbert 'before it should be made publick; but that was not allowed me, by reason of my absence from London when 'twas printing', for, though there may be faults in it, yet, as he hoped, there are 'none so great as may not by this Confession purchase pardon from a good natur'd Reader'. But it is difficult to pardon a writer who carefully explains that this is not his best work because he was much pushed with other business, or had a headache, or did not really write for publication. As Dryden says in introducing *The Fables*: 'They who think too well of their own performances, are apt to boast in their prefaces how little time their works have cost them, and what other business of more importance interfered; but the reader will be as apt to ask the question, why they allowed not a longer time to make their works more perfect? and why they had so despicable an opinion of their judges as to thrust their indigested stuff upon them, as if they deserved no better?'

It will be seen that a good preface must be written last, for no man knows how his work should be introduced until he can see it as a finished whole. How then can a new editor introduce himself to his readers before his work is even properly begun? He cannot acknowledge an indebtedness he has not yet incurred; he cannot explain what does not yet exist; he need not defend a course he has not yet taken;

and he should not try to excuse faults he has not yet committed. His best plan is to do no more than ask for a kindly reception, and with Raphe Robynson, the translator of *Utopia*, beg his readers, if they should find faults in his work, 'gentle and favourably' to 'winke at them'.

### THE DEATH PENALTY

SOME OF the murder trials that have taken place this year have once again made the public question the advisability (to put it no more strongly than that) of capital punishment. Some of the special points raised in particular cases seem to have been satisfactorily answered, but general principles still remain to trouble our consciences. We remember that the Select Committee of the House of Commons which made exhaustive inquiry and investigation into this matter in 1930 recommended that capital punishment should be suspended for a trial period of 5 years to test whether the murder rate would be affected, and there is an increasing number of people who believe that the suggestion was a good one.

One of the disturbing elements in capital punishment is its irrevocability. A jury is made up of fallible human beings, and in connexion with other crimes it is easy to cite recognized instances of the miscarriage of justice. It would be very strange if the only court that never made a mistake was the one that tried murder cases. In point of fact, however, mistakes are known to have been made. Oscar Slater was proved innocent eighteen-and-a-half years after he had been sentenced to death; just before the execution of Pellizioni another man was found to be guilty of the murder with which he had been charged, and Pellizioni received a free pardon; and as recently as 1952 McDermott was cleared of the murder charge on which he had been sentenced to death in 1947. Other cases could be given in Hungary, Germany, and Holland, and in addition to those cases that are actually known there are others about which distinguished judges and counsel have confessed that they have the very gravest anxiety. Holland has no capital punishment, and so two people convicted there of murder in 1923, but proved innocent in 1929, could be, and were released; in England they would have been dead. Indeed it is very doubtful whether their innocence would ever have been proved, because once a man is hanged there is little point in trying to prove that it was a mistake; it is too late to make any difference.

The main argument in favour of the death penalty is that it is a deterrent. But it is not such a powerful one as is sometimes supposed, because, in spite of the detective stories, few murders are carefully thought out beforehand; most of them are committed in passion and with no thought of the consequences. Even in cases of poisoning, which are clearly premeditated, there is a great deal to be said for the view of the experienced prison chaplain who said that no fear of punishment will ever deter a poisoner, because he is so conceited that he thinks he will never be found out. It is true that at first sight there would seem to be some justification for supposing that the abolition of the death penalty would make criminals more likely to carry arms, but the experience of the abolitionist countries does not bear that out. Official witnesses from such countries were questioned by the Select Committee of 1930, and in each case they replied with a firm assurance that there had been no increase in the carrying of arms. Indeed there is more to be said for the view that in some cases the fact of capital punishment makes the use of arms

more probable. A murderer who is in danger of arrest is more likely to shoot if he thinks his capture will result in execution in any case, and our criminal records show that in more than one instance a second murder has been committed in an effort to avoid the consequences of the first.

The question that must be asked, however, is not whether capital punishment is a deterrent, but whether it is a more effective deterrent than other penalties that could be substituted for it. Upon this point there is a good deal of evidence. Between thirty and forty of the world's States have now abolished the death penalty, including Holland as long ago as 1860 and Switzerland as recently as 1942. In none of these countries has its abolition resulted in more murders, and in none is there any popular demand for its re-instatement. The automatic granting of a reprieve in England between 14th April and 18th November in 1949 did not show that hanging had exercised a restraint that was unique, neither did the disuse of the death penalty in Scotland between 1928 and 1946.

A Christian will be more concerned with the argument that our aim in dealing with a sinner should be to reform him, and that if we hang him we have destroyed our last chance in this world of doing so. Most murderers are first offenders. In other lands they serve prison sentences, are usefully employed, and return eventually to normal life as useful citizens. There is no doubt that if British murderers were allowed to live some of them also could be turned into decent honest citizens. At any rate the attempt should be made, and those who say that British prison life is not likely to bring about such a change are not really arguing for the continuance of the death penalty but for the reform of the prison system. We cannot doubt that when a woman whose child has been brutally killed asks for mercy to be shown to his murderer she shows a more Christian spirit than those who clamour for him to be hanged.

J. ALAN KAY

---

## Articles

### METHODISM AND THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL

IT IS Methodism's proud boast that, as a Church, we were called into being by the Holy Spirit, and that our subsequent history proves His blessing upon us. Wesley himself could hardly have foreseen how truly the world would become our parish. Our world membership, even allowing for some quixotic branches, far exceeds that of the Church from which we sprang. Lasting religious and social effects are admitted by men of every school of thought and churchmanship. And Marxist students of social history claim to find Methodism in some ways a uniquely significant field for their research. For ourselves, we claim a true part in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, in true succession with those who would obey Christ's command to 'preach the Gospel to every creature'.

The gloomy picture of the Church of England in Wesley's Day, too often painted in the extreme colours of sectarian prejudice, has had to be modified. A Church which could produce the Epworth Rectory, for example, can hardly be dismissed with the charge of formalism. It is fair-minded attention to all the facts, which the defendant has rightly been allowed to speak in his own defence, and not just the kid-glove courtesy of the Ecumenical Movement, and the debate about Reunion, which requires us to appreciate the spiritual heritage of the Establishment in its Prayer Book and liturgical continuity, its scholarship, its spiritual and social contribution to national life through the parish system. While the Ecumenical Movement has brought us in many ways closer together, it has also meant a revived confessionalism, and Free Churchmen can hardly be unfair enough to criticize the Church of England for seeking to be what it is. We also have looked to our origins, and regretted it when Methodists seem insensitive to their heritage. We have to face the fact that we are dealing today with a very different Church from that which we imagine the Church of England to have been when we went out from it. They also have had time to consider (and regret) the circumstances of that time, and they would be the first to repudiate the misunderstanding levelled at Wesley under the charge of Enthusiasm. But what is more to the point is that, even where his work is fully appreciated, and responsibility admitted for some at least of the reasons for our separation, Anglicanism presents us with the question whether our solution was anything but partial, and temporary. Even when in its complacency and lack of vision the historic Church needs a deep shaking of the Spirit, does it not hold the faith, in the wholeness of the Divine Intention, better than 'the sectary'? Does the Holy Spirit ever lead men truly to what is partial? What we mean by 'formalism' is severely condemned, nowhere more than in the New Testament, yet is it not the function of a true 'form' to preserve the truth through times of 'formalism', of unbelief, and even of 'enthusiasm' for one particular aspect thereof? For the Schoolmen, in whose tradition Anglicanism largely stands, 'form' was not the opposite of 'spirit', but that in which it found its true expression. And, as every movement, especially those 'born of the Spirit', has found, unless it finds a due 'form', it degenerates irresponsibly into all kinds of licence. Partly on that very ground, Wesleyanism found fault with the Camp Meetings of the Primitives. It is neither fear of the Spirit, nor love of centralized



authority, which makes us critical of the attitude of some of the break-aways we experience today. A significant remark is made, in a review of Mgr Knox's monumental book on *Enthusiasm*, by none other than one of the younger and abler Congregational ministers today. In *The Scottish Journal of Theology* (June 1952), the Rev. W. A. Whitehouse referred to Bishop Butler's remark to Wesley that pretending to extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit was a very horrid thing, and added: 'You feel that though Butler has coined a phrase, the honours remain with Wesley. Yet Butler's was perhaps the longer view.'

This leads us back to truths which are so commonplace that one would not dream of setting them down, were not the situation so urgent. It is inevitable that movements of the Spirit take institutional form, and that must almost certainly mean not only what folk call 'formalism', but also a real vested interest, even when we seek to meet the challenge of a radically new situation. As Karl Barth has reminded us, a truly Reformed Church needs constant reformation under the Word of God, and that is a harder thing to undergo for ourselves than to extol in our spiritual ancestors. It is equally hard, in extolling our heritage, not merely to admit its defects, but to take the action essential to remedy them. But every organization which proclaims its origin in a 'return to New Testament Christianity' is in a singularly unhappy position. Its own principles can so easily be turned against itself. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God.

It is our constant claim that in the eighteenth century the Holy Spirit recalled the Church to neglected truth, and to fresh adventure, through Wesley and the societies of those who responded to his preaching. No true Methodist will wish to speak lightly of attempts to keep alive the memory of that 'mighty act', yet few will deny that by now it is a pretty herculean task. A good deal of it is already dead, and if we are true to our first principles, we shall not spend a moment in lamenting the fact. We remember it, at best, as something which under God has served its purpose. As Wedel reminds us, 'conscious primitivism is never primitive'; we can never 'return to New Testament Christianity', pure and simple, without repudiating something of what God has truly done since then, through His Spirit. As Wesley shows, by his own catholicity, we are heirs of every Christian century. The Apostolic Church is the Church of twenty centuries, not merely of the first, or the eighteenth. If God wills a revived Methodism, until such time as we take our place within a reunited Christendom, it will be by close attention to what He has done through His Spirit in the days since our origin. We are all of us, even the new fundamentalists, debtors to the liberal thought of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Is there no work of God also to be discerned in the Catholic revival of the same period? Has the darkness of the Middle Ages returned, to prevent the 'greater works' promised because Christ is ascended to His Father? Or is our prayer for revival being fulfilled in a place where we do not recognize it?

Friedrich Heiler is well known as a German Lutheran who left the Roman Catholic Church, to be an evangelical pastor. In his book *The Spirit of Worship* he gives his verdict, knowing both traditions from within.

The renaissance of evangelical Christianity is to be sought neither in modern liberalism, nor in its antithesis, the 'catastrophic' theology of the 'dialectical' theologians, but in the revival of the Catholic spirit. And, in point of fact, the Catholic spirit (not to be confused with the Roman Catholic) has for the last hundred years been engaged in reconquering the Reformation Churches. The Anglican Church, which of all the Protestant Churches

has retained the closest connexion with the Old Church, made the beginning. . . . Nearly one half of the members of the Anglican Church think of themselves as Catholics, not Protestants. . . . Anglo-Catholicism is one of the most hopeful and fruitful movements in the Western Church of the present day.<sup>1</sup>

There is, of course, the revived fundamentalism, which, as Bishop Newbigin pointed out, may soon be a 'third force' strong enough to spike the guns of the Ecumenical Movement. They make the confident claim to have recovered 'the spirit of Wesley', and of the New Testament, the marks of which are too often lacking in present-day Methodism, and they would welcome, and probably stand to gain still more, from a reiteration of time-honoured slogans. But where their presuppositions simply cannot be accepted, and where there is among us an urge to 'go forward from liberalism', there is real questioning and uncertainty. Having closely followed the Ecumenical discussion, we know that many of the old theological battle-cries are now echoes of a dead past. The new alignments cut right across denominational barriers, fundamentalism itself being an illustration of this. 'Thus, for instance, it is not the fact that "the common priesthood of all the faithful" is a Protestant doctrine, and "the priesthood of the ordained ministry" a Catholic doctrine, and that these two stand simply in opposition.'<sup>2</sup> What, for example, has happened to our historic principle when we hear Free Churchmen attributing the weakness of their particular chapel to the fact that 'we haven't got a minister'? Shades of early Methodism! No one, knowing Free Church life as it exists today, can but be dissatisfied with the 'statement of Free Church principles' which we sometimes hear. No amount of restatement, however moving, can alter the situation as it exists. The reason for our changed condition in Church-life is not to be attributed to indifference, or spiritual lukewarmness, or unbelief. Our people have responded again and again to our appeals, till now they leave them unmoved, because they are a reiteration of what once lived, but fail now to speak to our condition. The late Archbishop Temple reminded us that our present crisis was a cultural one, rather than a moral. And in his important Warrack Lectures on *The Communication of the Word*, the Rev. D. H. C. Read has put the same point in another way. He says that 'the apathy of which not only the Churches but all organizations complain is largely a defensive reaction' against the nervous strain of living in an insecure and radically changing world. May it be that 'the priesthood of all believers' imposes too great a demand on our people in the circumstances of our day? May it be that the personal, experiential religion, as our founding fathers exultantly knew it, is not 'for all men' in that form, but that it may be mediated to them in another, equally valid spiritually? The Catholic revival is not due to men's love of authority, or fear of thinking for themselves, or of standing on their own feet; it is an attempt to recover something which Methodism had, and lost, and which underlay all the personal experience, a sense of something objectively done, and given.

There are several ways in which all of us stand in debt to 'the Catholic spirit'. First, in the revived awareness of the Church, essential to faith as the Body of Christ. Need we be surprised if folk have sat loose to the Church, when we have lost faith in it as the sphere of redemption? For the New Testament, it can be said that the Church, as His Body, cannot be separated from the Risen Lord, even while, as Head, He is also its Judge. The Church is not an accident, nor an after-thought, nor is it merely the society of those who love Jesus. It exists by dominical



action, and divine call. We are privileged not to found or constitute it, but to enter it by faith, and there is a true sense in which, even in our sinfulness, we cannot defile it. It is Holy, as well as Apostolic, and its Holiness consists not in the aggregate of saintliness amongst all its members—that is the essence of the Pharisaism which has so largely weakened us. Its Holiness consists in possessing the Holiness of Christ; if we are faithless, He abideth faithful. On the human side, its Holiness consists, not in our achievement, but in our submission, and our dedication. The 'righteous' people are the 'right' people, those who honour God not first by their own works, but by accepting the right relationship with Himself, which He has provided for guilty sinners through faith in His Crucified Son. It is from our too man-centred thinking about the Church that 'the Catholic spirit' is slowly delivering us. Not that many of our layfolk are yet much affected by the change. Methodists know, for example, how often frustrated we are, in presence of a crying larger need, by 'love of our Church', which barely extends to toleration of fellow-Christians down the road. Our only hope lies in the recovery of catholicity, our oneness in the Body of Christ with all Christians, and that objectivity which knows the Church as more than our act, centred in Christ as the fruit of His finished work.

Secondly, to 'the Catholic spirit' we owe a recovery of a truer meaning of worship. The very word suggests something spontaneous, adoring wonder, the overflowing of love, and surely at its root must be the 'experience' which gives it meaning. But, as our own Wesley hymns make abundantly clear, where that happens, our joy is a response to something given, something done for us. It is not an awareness of our own feelings. It is objective, unselfconscious, except of self as receiving, and so as gladly penitent, admitting our worthlessness. It is Christ-centred, and in Him exultant. It is just this attitude which is often so sadly lacking, perhaps as much amongst Anglicans as ourselves. No one denies that at times people receive real help and inspiration; no one would wish so to judge them as to suggest that they do not worship at all, are ungrateful to God for His blessings, disbelieve in prayer for others' or their own need. The immediate question is of the wisest way to deal with this situation, when the crucial 'experience' is lacking. When, as in early Methodism, it was widely shared, it was the more easily communicated. Today, we do right to offer it, yet it is God's to give; 'so is everyone that is born of the Spirit'. Today, we submit, it is not just a Church's unfaithfulness which makes that immediate, personal experience less easy. But the Church, knowing its own givenness, will not admit that it must wait for that. Worship is its duty, to be *offered* to God in His glory, re-presenting His once-for-all finished work, whether or not we receive a felt blessing.

For us, quite truly, this should not perhaps be centred in preaching alone, but it should rise to its climax in the declaring of the Word of God. 'This is My Body.' 'Behold the Lamb of God, which beareth away the sin of the world.' And for us this should become the Acted Word, not merely in the 'drama' of the Lord's Supper, but as the Spoken Word is applied to the heart. But if we are honest with ourselves, the one point where our preaching is not at home is on the subject of Atoning Blood. No one will deny that there is much good preaching. We have much that we feel we can confidently say, and much of it is alive, thoughtful, helpful, even 'relevant'. But could anyone easily summarize our message on the central theme of the Cross, knowing that this is above all else what our Churches

exist to proclaim, and unflinchingly do proclaim? The BBC has more than once provoked the comment that 'the most evangelical preachers are the Catholics'. Where we are uncertain, a subject tends to take a minor place in preaching, or be omitted altogether. But what is admittedly a mystery to our minds is set forth in the Church's continuing liturgical worship.

People should hesitate before they dismiss the revived sacramental interest as 'apeing the Catholics'. It springs from a thorough dissatisfaction with the 'formalism' into which so much of our worship has sunk, through its loss of awe and mystery in a wholly man-centred attitude. We need again objective, Christ-centred worship, which is not dependent on mood of people, preacher, or celebrant, even be he the ablest or sincerest. We see in liturgy, not 'something out of a book', but a Church's true response to what God has already and irrevocably done, and which He has committed in trust to the Church, to guard against all the temporary foibles, or even honest doubts, of men. It is no mere submission to authority, for authority's sake, nor simply a desire to escape the burden of one's own individuality. It is faith in the givenness of the Gospel, and the desire to safeguard the wholeness of the faith, especially in its mystery and glory.

These two points alone have far-reaching consequences. We claim to be experts at least in some things: evangelism, for example. But should we feel confident to claim that in the last generation our methods have met with unquestioned success? Admittedly, every Church has been up against it, and no one has found the way to win the nation. That makes the sin of our dividedness all the more lamentable. For all its faults, the Anglican Church has just about held its position; it is the Free Churches which have borne the brunt of the decline. If the Church of England has not won the working classes, what is noteworthy is the appeal it makes to many we cannot hold. In moments of pique, we can say that they change for reasons of social advantage, but that is not a worthy comment. We may rather consider that, while Commando Campaigns, 'People's Services', and pub-raiding are forms of evangelism, which have hardly met with success commensurate with their effort, true worship, offered with a single eye to God alone, may be another, and more effective method. We had our own illustration of this, when our Methodist fellowship was real, and conversions took place, not so much under spell-binding preachers, as amid an expectant and worshipping community.

For years we have been theologically uncertain; in some ways, this could not be helped. But we felt increasingly sure of 'the social Gospel'. What is now significant is the hearing for the man who will say that 'the social Gospel is not enough', an uneasy comment on what once rang out so confidently from our pulpits. One could wish to be sure that this present attitude in the pew reflects the strong awareness that social righteousness must always be an integral part of the Christian message, but that it must spring from sound theological insights. But those who have kept close to the discussion of the social question must know the great and spiritually independent contribution which has been made by Catholic sociologists, from the basis of the Theology of the Incarnation. They have not simply reflected the aspirations of the Liberal Party or the working class; if they reached the same conclusions on some specific issues, it has been from a sacramental theology which has inspired some of the greatest acts of identification with men in need in our time. And, as times and moods have changed, they have less to withdraw.

Perhaps the revived confessionalism within the Anglican Church has made

reunion, for the moment, less near. We can hardly regret that Anglicans are determined to rescue the rites of Baptism and Confirmation from meaning little more than 'the done thing'. It will not be our place to lament their attempt to set their own house in order, even if it has sharper implications against ourselves. Even those of us who would raise no objection in principle to re-ordination will be loathe to commit ourselves to individual action; we would seek a solution which is possible for the whole Church. Meanwhile, the mutual debate must be more rigorously pursued. The Ecumenical discussion since Amsterdam has revealed that 'the essence of the situation is that, from each side of the division, we see the Christian faith and life as a consistent whole, but our two conceptions of the whole are inconsistent with each other. . . . Each of these views sees every part of the Church's life in the setting of the whole, so that even where the parts seem to be similar, they are set in a context, which, as yet, we find irreconcilable with the whole context of the other.'<sup>1</sup>

Many of our lay-folk, some of our ministers, maybe, will be wholly impatient with 'all this fuss about orders, due succession, and other trivialities'. Why cannot we all get together, and get on with the job? But impatience is not the same thing as penitence, for in penitence is born the charity and understanding, which today more than ever are essential. The time has gone by when 'it doesn't matter what we believe'. Christians of every denomination are vitally involved in the challenge to the Faith at its roots which is made by present-day unbelief. That challenge alone is making us realize afresh how much we have in common, and at stake. In some places, Methodism could, at present, close down without any loss; it is so little aware of its heritage that it witnesses to nothing distinctive at all. But that will not be the union in strength which we pray for, and which is all the harder to attain. Our task is to be better Methodists, not to answer one confession with another, but to ensure that Methodism's contribution to a united Church shall be out of its richness and fulness, as God has given it to us. But, at best, there will be times when we seek even that with a heavy heart. An age seeking community may decide to find it elsewhere than in a divided Church. Following Lund, our own D.T. Niles has said: 'We have learnt ways of co-operation, but the machinery of co-operation, on both the national and international level, will continue to become more and more cumbersome as the Church's indivisible task refuses to be accomplished by a divided Church. . . . The family of God in Christ is God's answer to the world hungry for community. We falsify God's answer by offering it a World Council of Churches.' It is not expediency, but a deep and evangelical concern for sinful men, which makes us regret our exclusion from Anglican altars, as brethren in Christ. As Newbigin contends, in *The Reunion of the Church*, there will always be doctrinal difference, even within the united Church. 'The basis of union is a reality in the personal realm. It is the finished work of Christ for all men, and the unity with Him in the Spirit which is given to believers.' That is fundamentally what we, as Methodists, have understood as 'fellowship'.

T. J. FOINETTE

<sup>1</sup> (Quoted in *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century*, by Roger Lloyd, 1.139.)

<sup>2</sup> Fr. A. G. Hebert, *Ecumenical Review*, April 1952, p. 239.

<sup>3</sup> Oliver Tomkins, *The Church in the Purpose of God*, p. 28.

# JOHN WESLEY AND IRELAND\*

## INTRODUCTION

IT HARDLY ought to be the purpose of an essay on 'John Wesley and Ireland' simply to narrate in summary form, the story of Wesley's twenty-one visits to that country; that would be tantamount to giving a ten-thousand-word summary of the first volume of Crookshank's *History of Methodism in Ireland* or of Robert Haire's more recent publication, *Wesley's One-and-twenty Visits to Ireland*. We have endeavoured to give some account of the impressions which Wesley both gained of, and made upon, Ireland, his early contacts therewith, the growth of Methodism therein, persons he met, and friendships he made.

By the limits imposed by the title of the essay, we must confine our study to John Wesley, although it must not be forgotten that his brother Charles was a valiant labourer there too and that without a noble band of supporters John's work in that country would soon have been cut short.

I have been impressed by Wesley's habits in Ireland with regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper—so very different from his habits in Scotland. Accordingly, I have dealt with this topic in Section VI. I do not know of this aspect of Wesley's ministry in Ireland having been dealt with before; perhaps this is the most original, maybe the only, contribution to be made on the subject of 'John Wesley and Ireland'. The Rev. Thomas H. Barratt set us all thinking in his valuable article in the LONDON QUARTERLY for July 1923 on 'The Lord's Supper in Early Methodism', but he did not enter into details, as I have tried to do in this essay. Nevertheless, I am building on the foundations he laid nearly thirty years ago.

A consideration of 'John Wesley and Ireland' requires mention not only of the man, but also of the country; therefore, the first section of this essay deals with Ireland as John Wesley knew it in the eighteenth century.

## I. IRELAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

All students of Wesley are familiar with eighteenth-century England which formed the background against which the great evangelist fulfilled his mission of spreading 'scriptural holiness over the land'. Historians like C. J. Abbey, J. H. Overton, W. E. H. Lecky, E. Halévy, and, in more recent times, Maximin Piette, Dr J. H. Whiteley, J. Wickham Legg, and Professor Norman Sykes, have laid us under deep obligation for illuminating and careful studies of English life—both secular and religious—in the eighteenth century. With contemporary writers like Horace Walpole and Lord Hervey, these later historians are in agreement in their records of absentee parsons, pluralistic livings, ill-kept Churches, the indifference and coarseness of the working classes and the scepticism of the upper classes. In the Church, which unfortunately had been drained of its vitality and had lost many men of high calibre by four purges in little over a century, discipline was at a very low ebb. 'As I told Jack,' wrote young Sam Wesley to his mother in October 1739, 'I am not afraid the Church should excommunicate him (discipline is at too low an ebb).' As late as 1786, John Wesley exclaimed: 'O what a curse in this poor land are pluralities and non-residence.'

If this was the condition of Church and State in England, it cannot be assumed that in Ireland they were any better. In fact, in some respects, conditions there

\* Winning entry in Eayrs' Essay Prize, 1949.

were much worse, and behind all the sufferings and privations of the poorer classes lay the unfortunate events of the late seventeenth century and the short-sighted political and economic measures of the eighteenth century. Wesley was a shrewd observer wherever he went and frequently in his *Journal* he gives an account of conditions as he saw them. Sometimes he includes a summary of a book he happened to be reading on local history. Such entries are always augmented by his own reflections—generally useful, never irrelevant, always interesting, sometimes wrong! The accounts of his Irish tours are full of interesting references to local scenery—the Shannon (III.343), the walls of Limerick (III.399), Gardens (III.404-5, 478, IV.175, 265), rocks at Dublin (IV.38), Dunmore Cave (IV.513), abbeys and ruins often call forth comments.<sup>1</sup>

Eighteenth-century Ireland was sharply divided. On the one hand, there were the native Irish, who were mostly Roman Catholic; on the other hand, there were the immigrant population of Scots, a unique colony of Germans, as well as the English who had settled there. This latter class was a mixed crowd of Church of England, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Seceders, and so forth.

The Irish were the aboriginal Celts and descendants of the Norman-English settlers. It is said that they numbered about a million toward the end of the seventeenth century. The Protestants numbered only about two hundred thousand, but they held at least four-fifths of the land and were by far the richest and most civilized of the population.

The history of Ireland just previous to Wesley's day is not a happy record. Toward the close of the seventeenth century, Tyrconnel, the Lord Deputy for Ireland for James the Second, sought, with French aid, to make a 'now or never' effort to purge Ireland of all 'foreigners'—i.e. the Protestants—and to win 'Ireland for the Irish'. On 24th March 1689, James the Second landed and was soon parading the streets of Dublin, which were bedecked with flags and flowers to give him welcome. He assembled Parliament and passed the 'Act of Attainder' which sentenced to death nearly three thousand Protestants, among whom were half the peerage of Ireland. The English fled for refuge to Enniskillen and the Scots to Londonderry. The Siege of Londonderry (1689) is a well-known story in English history, a tale of three months of horror and privation. In 1690, King William himself crossed to Ireland, the Irish capitulated, and King James fled to France. The year 1691 saw the complete reduction of Ireland by Ginkell and John Churchill, later Earl of Marlborough.

Ireland, as John Wesley knew it, was the logical outcome of these savage events of the late seventeenth century. 'The history of Ireland during the fifty years that followed its conquest by William the Third, is one which no Englishman can recall without shame.'<sup>2</sup> Poyning's Law kept the Irish Parliament shorn of all independence, and in 1719 a law was passed which made all laws passed by the Parliament of England and Wales valid also in Ireland. 'Wood's Half-pence' (the granting of a charter to William Wood to mint coin for Ireland) called forth in 1724 Dean Swift's *Drapier's Letters*; and in 1729 the British Government disfranchised all Roman Catholics in Ireland. Thus five-sixths of the population were without a vote and disqualified for civil office. Toward the end of the century, the British Government relented somewhat; they abolished many of the restrictions on Irish trade and modified Poyning's Law. English troops had to be withdrawn to serve in the American War and the 'Protestant Volunteers', who



took their place in Ireland, thought that, like the Americans, they also had rights worth fighting for. At last, by the oratorical efforts of Richard Grattan, the 'Declaration of Right', declaring complete legislative independence of Ireland, was carried in 1782.

Thus for the greater part of the eighteenth century the Irish lived in their own land as strangers, regarded by the Protestant land-owners as mere settlers. Housed in little cabins, uneducated, often drunken and superstitious (for their Roman Catholicism was little better than superstition), they lived the lives of serfs. These conditions are reflected several times in the writings of John Wesley. They form the background to the letter he wrote to Richard Steel, his assistant at Armagh:

Use no snuff. . . . I suppose no other nation in Europe is in such vile bondage to this silly, nasty, dirty custom as the Irish are. Touch no dram. . . . In Ireland . . . I would sacredly abstain from this, because the evil is so general; and to this and snuff and smoky cabins, I impute the blindness which is so exceeding common throughout the nation.<sup>3</sup>

In another place, he remarked about these cabins:

One who looks on the common Irish cabins might imagine Saturn still reigned here:

*Cum frigida parvas  
Praeberet spelunca domos; ignemque laremque,  
Et pecus et dominos, communi clauderet umbra.*

*Communi umbra* indeed; for no light can come into the earth or straw-built cavern, on the master and his cattle, but at one hole; which is both window, chimney, and door.

Later, in a treatise on *Original Sin* he gives a fuller description:

The bulk of the natives of Ireland are to be found in or near their little cabins throughout the kingdom, most of which are their own workmanship, consisting of four earthen walls, covered with straw, or sods, with one opening in the side wall, which serves at once for door, window, and chimney. Here, in one room, are the cow and pig, the woman with her children, and the master of the family. Now, what knowledge have these rational animals? They know how to plant and boil their potatoes, to milk their cow, and put their clothes on and off, if they have any besides a blanket; but other knowledge they have none, unless in religion. And how much do they know of this? A little more than the Hottentots, and not much. They know the names of God, and Christ, and the Virgin Mary. They know a little of St Patrick, the Pope, and the Priest; how to tell their beads, to say *Ave Maria* and *Pater Noster*; to do what penance they are bid, to hear Mass, confess, and pay so much for the pardon of their sins. But as to the nature of religion, the life of God in the soul, they know no more (I will not say, than the Priest, but) than the beasts of the field.<sup>4</sup>

Wesley could not read, without shame and sympathy, of the terrible persecution to which these people had been subjected. After reading an account of the massacre of 1641, he remarked: 'Nor is it any wonder that those who are born Papist generally live and die such, when the Protestants can find no better ways to convert them than Penal laws and Acts of Parliament.' Yet when they were not provoked by the priest, he found them a docile people, willing to hear his message. He mentions 'the softness and courtesy of the Irish' and after preaching at Templemacateer in 1748, he commented: 'So civil a people as the Irish in general I never saw, either in Europe or America.' Docility, however, demanded discipline—the people,

however, being so soft and delicate that the least slackness utterly destroys them'. He found that the poor in Ireland were, in general, well-behaved, 'all the ill-breeding is among well-dressed people'.

Wesley often had these Irish among his hearers; usually their priests forbade them but on one occasion, in spite of the priest, they came; whereupon the priest himself joined his flock and listened to Wesley. On another occasion, Wesley was mistaken for a Jesuit, when a priest, who was in the crowd, retorted: 'No, he is not, I would to God he was!'

These native Irish preserved their own language\* and Thomas Walsh, one of Wesley's most valiant and valued assistants (of whom Wesley had a very high opinion), was able to preach to them in Irish and often did so. Walsh himself was an Irish convert from Roman Catholicism and ever had the welfare of his own people at heart. Early in the eighteenth century the lower house of Convocation of the Established Church of Ireland proposed that an attempt be made to convert the Roman Catholics by preaching to them in Irish. Wesley had different ideas—'Let all the clergy . . . live like the Apostles', whom alone the Roman Catholics recognize to be superior to their own priests, and that would be, said Wesley: '*A Short Method of Converting all the Roman Catholics in the Kingdom of Ireland.*'<sup>5</sup>

While all the Roman Catholic population was disfranchised, half of the Protestants—small in number as they were—were disfranchised also. The Presbyterians, who were in a large majority in Ulster, were excluded from all civil, military, and municipal offices. Thus the rule in Ireland, as well as its administration, was in the hands of the Established Church; that is, about half the population of the country.

Of the state of the Established Church in Ireland, we learn, not only from the usual histories, but also from Wesley's own comments. Undoubtedly, it was in a favoured position, and attracted to itself the upper classes of the English in the land. Wesley says that, on his first visit to Ireland (1747), he preached to 'as gay and senseless congregation' as he ever saw. This was at St Mary's, Dublin. St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, was the famous centre of Anglicanism in the capital. In 1711 Dr Jonathan Swift became its celebrated Dean.

On the whole, the state of the Church seems to have been much the same—neither much better nor much worse—than that of the Established Church in England. In 1752, Wesley was 'greatly shocked' by the 'carelessness and indecency' at St Patrick's, Dublin, and in 1758 'much grieved' at St Peter's at the behaviour of the 'rich and honoured sinners'. He says their behaviour 'shocked common sense as well as religion'. At other times, the solemnity of a service pleased him. On Sunday, 13th June 1773, he was at Tanderagee and was greatly impressed by the service; the rector, Dr Leslie, was the preacher:

At half-hour past eleven the Church Service began. The curate read prayers exceedingly well, and the rector preached with uncommon earnestness. But what I admired was (1) the cleanness of the church, equal to any I have seen in England; (2) the serious behaviour of the congregation; and (3) the excellent singing by forty or fifty voices, half men and half women. I have heard nothing like it in any church since I came into the kingdom.

The Church in general suffered much as it did in England and the same causes operated with additional difficulties created by circumstances peculiar to Ireland.

In the early years of the eighteenth century, the state of Church buildings was a grave problem. Many of the churches had been damaged or destroyed in the wars of the previous century, and congregations had been driven away. Pluralism was rife and its ill effects were not mitigated by ill-paid curates who 'were objects of pity, or even contempt to their parishioners, rather than respect'.<sup>7</sup> As in England the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was celebrated three or four times a year in most parishes. Wesley informs us that the usual time for Sunday morning service in Ireland was 'a little before twelve'.

The period was one of 'supineness and inaction as to religion . . . during which the Church of Ireland did not increase the number of her adherents and probably only managed to retain within her communion those whom she had baptized into its fellowship'.<sup>8</sup>

Wesley's relations with the clergy were, on the whole, happier than with their counterparts in England. On his first visit in 1747, he found the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr Charles Cobb, prejudiced against Methodism, but Wesley 'had the favour of conversing with him two or three hours, in which I answered an abundance of objections'. On several subsequent visits he found friendly clergy who allowed him to preach in Church and others who themselves came to hear him preach. There was, for example, Mr Glass, rector of Ahascragh and the rector of the neighbouring parish; or the clergyman of Portarlinton, who 'received us gladly'; the two clergymen who talked with Wesley over the dining-table about Justification and Inspiration; the Rev. Moore Booker, Vicar of Delvin, who stood by the Methodist Society in his town in spite of opposition and false charges; the Rev. M. Ellison, rector of Castlebar, who invited Wesley to assist him at the Lord's Supper; and the minister (vicar or rector?) at Athlone who invited him to read prayers in the Church. At Londonderry, he was once given a pew of honour, next to the mayor, which led to his remark: 'What have I to do with honour? Lord, let me always *fear*, not *desire* it.'

In later years he was as venerated in Ireland as he was in England and an honoured visitor to many Churches. The Bishop of Derry gave full consent to Dr Wilson, the rector of Newtown Stewart, to allow Wesley to preach in his Church in May 1787. It must have surprised Wesley to find two clergymen, on another occasion, wishing to partake of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper with the Society at Castlebar on Tuesday evening 19th May 1789. It was held at 6.30 p.m. —surely an unusual day and hour for celebrations in the eighteenth century.<sup>9</sup> Wesley's friendship with Dr Francis Corbett, 'the good old dean' of St Patrick's, Dublin, was one of the great pleasures which his contacts with Ireland afforded him. The dean invited Wesley to come within the rails and assist in administering the Sacrament on Sunday 10th April, and again on Sunday 23rd July 1775. 'This also', remarked Wesley on the former occasion, 'was a means of removing much prejudice from those who were zealous for the Church.'

Thus Wesley's relations with the Established Church in Ireland were, on the whole, quite cordial. There was, of course, opposition in Ireland as in England, and this we shall examine later. Before we leave this section on Ireland in the eighteenth century, and Wesley's contacts therewith, a consideration of the other Protestant bodies in the country is necessary.

The Presbyterians were numerous in the region of Londonderry and Antrim, but like their brethren in England, they were tainted with Arianism and the



enthusiasm which had marked their early years had largely evaporated. Charles Wesley in his *Journal* mentions 'Arian Presbyterians', they were the forbears of the modern Unitarians. The spirit of cold rationalism led to what Crookshank calls 'spiritual paralysis'. Vacant charges were numerous and the ministry in general was deteriorating. Several times, especially during his visits of 1785 and 1787, Wesley found the Presbyterian ministers friendly and accepted the use of their meeting houses. On 8th June 1787 he occupied a room at the invitation of the Presbyterian minister at Ballymena, a room which is now occupied by the Unitarians; and on his last visit in 1789, he preached at Newtownards 'to a multitude of people in the Presbyterian Meeting-house'. The beginnings of Methodism in Belfast owed much to the use of the First Presbyterian Church in Rosemary Street after Wesley had said: 'Where to preach in Belfast I did not know.' Armagh, Newtown (several times), Rathfriland, Antrim, Lisburn, Newry (repeatedly), Coleraine, Cootehill, Kilrea—all are places where he was permitted to use the Presbyterian meeting-house.

Of Presbyterian stock were the Seceders. In Scotland this sect became 'a distinct type . . . adding bitterness to religious spirit and an animation to the social life'.<sup>18</sup> George Whitefield had an unhappy encounter with them, and Wesley pronounced severe judgement upon them. When he was at Tanderagee, on Thursday 9th April 1767, he heard that there were some Seceders who had settled in the neighbourhood:

I was not glad to hear that some of the Seceders had settled in these parts also. Those of them who have yet fallen in my way are more uncharitable than the Papists themselves. I never yet met a Papist who avowed the principle of murdering heretics; but a Seceding minister being asked, 'Would not you, if it was in your power, cut the throats of all the Methodists?' replied directly: 'Why, did not Samuel hew Agag in pieces before the Lord?' I have not yet met a Papist in this kingdom who would tell me to my face all but themselves must be damned; but I have seen Seceders enough who would make no scruple to affirm none but themselves could be saved. And this is the natural consequence of their doctrine; for, as they hold (1) that we are saved by faith alone; (2) that faith is the holding such and such opinions; it follows, all who do not hold those opinions have no faith, and therefore cannot be saved.

It was a Seceder who prayed: 'Lord, sweep away the Methodists from the face of the earth with the besom of destruction.' It must have come as a great surprise to Wesley to find, on Sunday 7th June 1787, the Seceders offering him the use of their meeting-house. 'In the evening', he says, 'the Seceders (who would think it?) freely gave me the use of their large meeting-house.' We do not know whether this incident led Wesley to revise his opinion of this fanatical sect; probably not, for only a fortnight previous to this favour, a Seceder at Newtown Stewart took away the key of the church which he attended in order to prevent Wesley preaching there. Crookshank says the Seceders came to Ireland in 1746 and justified their mission on the ground of 'the unfaithfulness of the existing ministry'.

The other section of the Protestants in Ireland were settlers from the Continent, the 'Palatines' with whom Wesley had many and fruitful contacts. We shall deal with these later when we come to deal with personalities, especially Philip Embury and Barbara Heck, whose conversion to Methodism had such significant results on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition to these Palatines, there were a few other Germans whom Wesley touched in his visits to Northern Ireland. He says that on

Wednesday 20th April 1748 at Dublin, he 'spent an agreeable hour with Mr Miller, the Lutheran minister'. Charles Wesley had met this person twice in the previous year<sup>11</sup> and described him as 'a simple, loving man'. Miller gave the Wesleys some useful information about Zinzendorf, how he had printed 'several passages from my *Journal* which tended to prejudice the Lutherans against the Methodists'. The house in Marlborough Street, where Wesley preached on his first visit to Ireland on 10th August 1747, was originally designed for a Lutheran Church and was first used in 1697 by the remnants of the Duke of Brandenburg's army, disbanded by the Treaty of Riswick, and at that time stationed in Ireland.

Wesley also came across some of his old friends, the Moravians; this time in the person of Benjamin La Trobe who had established a religious society in Dublin and on Wesley's arrival in the city for the first time (1747), immediately read to his flock a statement of the differences between the Moravians and the Methodists. In his later years, Wesley visited the Moravian settlement at Gracehill, Ballymena, admiring 'the neatness of the rooms and the courtesy of the inhabitants'; but concluding, 'if they have most courtesy, we have more love'. Did this visit to Gracehill stir up memories of Marienborn and Herrnhut of nearly fifty years ago? We wonder!

So much, then for 'Wesley's Ireland' and Wesley's contacts with the various bodies ministering therein. We must now retrace our steps a little and consider Wesley's first contacts with the country and the commencement of his work there.

## II. EARLY CONTACTS

There can be little wonder that Ireland held a favoured place in Wesley's affections, for contacts between that country and the Wesley family existed long before John was born at Epworth in 1703. On his father's side, both the Wesley and the Wellesley branch of the family were represented in Ireland, and on his mother's side the Annesleys were there in Mrs Wesley's great uncle, the first earl of Anglesea. In 1728 Charles Wesley had, by the Grace of God, 'a fair escape' (as his brother, John, expressed it) from becoming a rich Irish landlord, the heir of Mr Garrett Wesley, of Dangan, Member of Parliament for County Meath. In 1731 contacts with Ireland were resumed when John addressed many an unanswered letter to his friend 'Aspasia', who had become the wife of Dr Delany, the Dean of St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin. Shortly afterwards, when the Holy Club was formed at Oxford, one of its earliest members was young William Morgan, elder son of the Remembrancer to the Court of the Exchequer, Dublin. William died; but, satisfied by Wesley's answer to those who blamed the rigours of Methodism for the boy's death, Morgan's father sent his other and only surviving son to take his brother's place under Wesley's tutelage.

Wesley first visited Ireland in 1747, but the way for his coming had been prepared. Returning from Georgia in 1738, George Whitefield, by storms and no doubt by Providence too, had been blown on to the coast of Ireland, and within a short time of landing was preaching, with Bishop Burscough's consent, in Limerick Cathedral. Three days later he visited eminent persons, including the Dean of St Patrick's, Dr Delany, mentioned above.

The real heralds of the Methodist revival, however, were an unknown soldier and Thomas Williams. The soldier was the product of Wesley's many contacts with the army and the forerunner of much good work Wesley was yet to do among

soldiers in Ireland. It was at the invitation of this soldier and the society which gathered round him that John Cennick came to Dublin in 1746 and began to preach at Skinner's Alley. Cennick was followed in 1747 by Thomas Williams, who took possession of the disused Lutheran chapel in Marlborough Street, Dublin, which has the honour of being the first Methodist Chapel in Ireland. Whether Williams was sent to Ireland by Wesley or whether he went of his own accord is a question raised, but not answered, in the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* (I.94).

There was method in Wesley's pioneering—as in all things which he did. He never went at random, as the 1746 *Minutes* of Conference reveal:

- Q. What is a sufficient call of Providence to a new place, suppose Edinburgh or Dublin?
- A. 1. An invitation from someone that is worthy, from a serious man, fearing God, who has a house to receive us.
  2. A probability of doing more good by going thither than by staying longer where we are.

There seems to be something behind this mention of Dublin, and the possibility of a call coming from across the Irish sea was evidently in his mind. He had to wait a few years for the call to Edinburgh, but not long before he was invited to Dublin. It was Thomas Williams who induced him to travel; and in response to the request, Wesley landed at Dublin on Saturday 8th August 1747 with John Trembath and (probably) William Tucker as his companions.<sup>18</sup> This was the first of twenty-one visits—almost one every other year—which Wesley paid to Ireland. He made many friends there; had much joy in the work and left its shores for the last time on 12th July 1789 amid a scene which must have reminded those who witnessed it of St Paul's departure from Ephesus as recorded in Acts 20. Some of the persons, deeds and results of those visits form the subject matter of the following pages.

### III. WESLEY AND HIS SOCIETIES

From the early foundations laid by Cennick and Williams, and after John Wesley's first visit in August 1747 was followed by that of his brother in September of the same year, Methodism steadily grew in Ireland. From Wesley's *Journal* it is possible to get a fairly good impression of his methods and their success. He was usually assured of hospitality; although once he had difficulty in finding somewhere to stay:

Tues. 12 (May 1778)—Setting out early I intended to lodge at Clare-galway; but we found there was no lodging to be had. However, they told us there was a good inn at Shrule, not many miles farther. And there we found a house; but it afforded no food either for man or beast; so we were obliged to push on for Ballinrobe, which we reached about eleven o'clock.

Lodging having been secured, he would next choose some spot where a crowd could easily assemble, and after preaching he would meet 'the society'. He preached in 'all sorts and conditions' of places. Most frequently he chose the market-place, if possible on market-day. Examples here are too numerous to quote but the following are a fair selection. In each case the reference is to the Standard Edition of the *Journal*, volume and page. If the weather prevented him from preaching out of doors he would seek the use of some prominent public building.

We frequently read of his preaching in 'the exchange' (IV.163, 400), the Linen Hall (V.113), the 'assembly room' (V.134), the courtyard (V.138, 204, 316), the court-house (V.326), the 'session house' (V.316). True to his usual custom, he never lost the opportunity of preaching to soldiers and frequently he took his stand at the barracks (IV.377, 400, V.137, 211, 212). On other occasions we read of improvised pulpits being used, and often in unexpected places—on the village green (V.113), in the main street (V.132, 133), on a table in the street (V.328), in a garden (VI.200, III.485), once 'in a cowhouse' (VII.490). Once he preached 'from the window of an unfinished house' (III.340), on another occasion he preached from a natural amphitheatre at Limerick which must have reminded him of Gwennap:

July 2 (Sun.)—1758—I preached in the island near Limerick, both morning and evening, standing on the side of a large hollow adjoining the old camp. The ground on the sides of it slopes upward, so that the people sat on the grass, row above row. Such an amphitheatre I never saw before, in which thousands of hearers were so commodiously placed, and they seemed earnestly to attend to our Lord's invitation, 'Come, for all things are now ready!'

Preaching in a churchyard was not new to him, for he had preached from his father's tombstone in Epworth churchyard, and so, on 2nd June 1758 we find him preaching from the churchyard at Holly-mount. By precept and example, he kept the Methodists in Ireland, as in England, to the habit of early morning preaching—usually 5 a.m.

From such beginnings Methodism spread; and Wesley lived long enough to see Methodist preaching-houses built in many towns and cities in Ireland. The story of the progress of Methodism in Ireland is hardly relevant to this essay, but in order to form some idea of its growth during the last twenty years of Wesley's life the salient features of Wesley's visits are mentioned.

Wesley's tours of Ireland were well planned. In later years, especially, places and times of his preaching were methodically arranged, and punctually (as becoming a 'Methodist') he kept to his programme. The punctuality with which Wesley, to the last, kept to his prearranged schedule, is a remarkable achievement considering his age (in later years), his health, bad weather, and very bad roads. He often mentions the excessive rain and the 'miserable roads' (VI.65, 191, VII.90, 292, 504), and several times he suffered from a broken coach-axle when travelling in Ireland.

It would appear that he made his own arrangements for his tours and himself notified his host in advance of his arrival. A plan of itinerancy was printed and forwarded as a circular to the places he intended to visit. In later years he became as well-known a figure on the roads of Ireland as on those of England.

Apparently his plan sometimes appeared in the public Press. The plan of his 1789 tour appeared in the *Dublin Chronicle* for Tuesday 7th April. Other plans, for 1773 and 1778, appeared in the *Belfast Newsletter*. As a fair specimen of one of these plans, we have chosen that for 1789 which was published in the *Dublin Chronicle*:

We hear that the Rev. Mr Wesley, who arrived a few days ago in this city, intends visiting most of the principal towns in this kingdom, with his usual celerity, though in the 87th year of his age; and is to be at Mr Tyrell's, at BALLYLONAN, on Monday, the

13th of April; TYRELL'S PASS, the 14th, at ten o'clock; at MULLINGAR and LONGFORD, in the evening of the 15th; KENAGH, the 16th; ATHLONE, the 17th; AUGHIRM, the 20th; in EYRE-COURT at noon, and BIRR, in the evening of the 21st; COOLEY-LOUGH, the 22d; PORTARLINGTON, at noon, MOUNTMELICK, at night, the 23d; MARYBOROUGH, the 24th; CARLOW, the 25th; ENNISCORTHY, at noon, and WEXFORD, in the evening of the 27th; WATERFORD, the 28th;—Friday, May 1st, CLONMEL at noon, CAPPOQUIN, in the evening; CORK, the 2d; BANDON, the 6th; returns to CORK, the 9th; KILFENNON, the 11th; LIMERICK, the 12th; PALLICE, at noon, the 13th—and returns to LIMERICK; KILCHRIST, the 15th; BALLINROBE, the 16th; CASTLEBAR, the 17th; SLIGO, Wednesday the 20th; MANOR HAMILTON, at nine of the clock, and ANNADALE, in the evening of the 21st; BALLYCONNELL, the 22d; KILMORE on the 23rd; CAVAN in the morning, and CLONES at night, on the 24th; and at BROOKBOROUGH on Tuesday, the 26th; ENNISKILLEN, at noon, and SEDARE, in the evening of the 27th; KIRLISH LODGE, the 28th; NEWTOWN STEWART, the 29th; LONDONDERRY, the 30th;—COLERAINE, June 3rd; BALLYMENA, the 5th; ANTRIM, the 6th, at nine o'clock in the morning, and LISBURN in the evening; BELFAST, the 8th; PORTAFERRY, the 9th; STRANGFORD, at ten o'clock, and DOWNPATRICK, at night, the 10th; TANDRAGEE, the 11th; CHARLEMONT, the 14th; DUNGANNON, the 15th; ARMAGH the 16th; NEWRY the 17th; DROGHEDA, the 18th; and returns to DUBLIN the 19th.

Wesley's knowledge of the topographical features of the country must have been very exact to enable him to plan his tours so carefully in advance; and not only to plan them, but to fulfil them so punctually.

His knowledge of his societies, too, was accurate and his judgement, usually, unerring. His sending of Mr and Mrs Rogers to Dublin, for example, was true statesmanship—though many did not regard it so at the time, and Wesley had to withstand much uninformed criticism. On 17th February 1785 he referred to the incident in a letter to Arthur Keene:

When several disapproved of my sending Mr Rogers and his wife to Dublin, supposing them unequal to the task, I was determined to overrule, believing myself to be a competent judge both of their gifts and grace. And the event has answered my expectations. I am not disappointed of my hope, and I am persuaded neither they nor you will ever be weary of well-doing.

James Rogers had only recently married Hester Ann Roe whose *Experience and Spiritual Letters*<sup>11</sup> is a valuable source of information on certain aspects of early Methodism.

There is a feature of Wesley's relations with his Societies in Ireland (as elsewhere) which has received little attention, but which is worthy of note. Arriving at Cork on Monday 4th August 1760, Wesley says: 'I read some select letters at five in the morning to those who desired to hear them.' On Tuesday 11th April 1758, when at Dublin, he says: 'On Tuesday evening, I read the letters by one of which a poor backslider who had been wandering near eleven years was cut to the heart and determined to return to Him from whom he had so deeply revolted.' According to Wesley's entry for the following Tuesday, one of the letters read on this occasion was from Mr Gillies 'giving an account of a society lately formed at Glasgow for promoting Christian knowledge among the poor'. Wesley comments: 'I could not then help expressing my amazement that nothing of this kind had been attempted in Ireland, and inquiring if it was not high time that such a society should be formed in Dublin.' Surely the reading of these letters in the early Methodist



Societies is an echo of primitive Christianity, of the days when St Paul's letters were publicly read in the Churches. This is probably another instance of Wesley's emulation of the ante-Nicene Church to which he turned so often for guidance in the organization of his societies and the regulation of his own spiritual life. Wesley encouraged his people to write down accounts of their conversions and subsequent experience of the grace of God. Some of these letters he reproduces in the *Journal*, while those of his preachers have been preserved in Jackson's *Lives of the Early Methodist Preachers*, or *Wesley's Veterans*, edited by John Telford—each one a 'pilgrim's progress'.

Methodism attracted to itself men and women of all denominations, and among those who were drawn into the societies in Ireland by Wesley's own personal appeal and influence, were people differing in background from Quakers to Roman Catholics. In the *Journal* he often mentions Roman Catholics who listened to him and it was Thomas Walsh, himself a convert from Romanism, who pleaded with him to allow his preachers to administer the Holy Communion to the Roman Catholics who, on becoming Methodists, were cut off from the administrations in their own Church. Henry Moore believed that Wesley's refusal was a sorrow which hastened Walsh's early death. We have no reason to believe that the Roman Catholic element was large in Irish Methodism. Wesley says that there were nine Papists and seven Quakers in the society at Tyrell's Pass in 1748.

The Quakers figure prominently among those who listened to Wesley. Dr Rutty, a good friend and physician to Wesley and his preachers, was a Quaker. He attended Wesley in 1748 when he was in Dublin, and Christopher Hopper, one of Wesley's preachers, speaks of him as 'that venerable and wise physician', adding that Dr Rutty ministered to him 'without fee or reward' (1756). Wesley visited the doctor again in 1775, only three weeks before he, Dr Rutty, died.

It seems to have been Wesley's custom to baptize Quakers on their joining a Methodist Society. This had always been his custom for he believed that baptism was 'the initiatory sacrament which enters us into covenant with God'. 'By baptism', he continues, 'we are admitted into His Church, and consequently made members of Christ, its Head.' More than once in Ireland he found hospitality among the Quakers. James Gough, a highly esteemed Quaker itinerant, heard Wesley preach 'standing at a friend's shop door'. Joseph Fry, a Quaker of Mountmellick, was another good friend to Wesley. Wesley once described Fry's wife as 'an Israelite indeed!' At the same time the Quakers were, once at least, among those who raised opposition to the Methodists. On 25th April 1758 he found that 'some of the Quakers (so called) had laboured much to dissuade their people from coming'—the parenthesis indicates Wesley's esteem for Quakers of the best type. Garrett von Hessian was a Dublin Quaker of Dutch extraction who met both John and Charles Wesley. Contacts with such men as these meant much to Wesley, to them and also to Methodism in Ireland generally.

JOHN C. BOWMER

(To be continued)

## AN ANNOTATION TO WESLEY'S JOURNAL

JOHN WESLEY'S *Journal* is now an acknowledged classic of English literature while the record of his extensive journeyings has become part of the history of England and, indeed, of a much wider field. There is gripping interest in the details he recorded, many of which become illuminated when reconciled with the reminiscences and diaries others have also left. There were many who were associated with Wesley, and though not mentioned in the *Journal* shed light on the *Journal* by their contact with Wesley at different times and in different places. One such person was Thomas Rutherford, whose account of his spiritual pilgrimage deserves a place in the annals of English devotional literature: in choice language he has left a record of God's dealing with him and described how, through many doubts and fears and prejudices, he was brought through what the saints would have called 'the dark night of the soul' to a confident assurance of God's love for him, though he was called upon to suffer much personal loss of family and friends and was distressed by ill-health. The record of his life is one of the unseen threads running through the *Journal of John Wesley* and the purpose of this article is to annotate the *Journal* by reference to Thomas Rutherford. First, the relative passage from Wesley's *Journal* will be quoted, then, an annotation will follow.

MONDAY, 21ST MAY 1771. '*I preached at Morpeth. . .*'

Among those who heard Wesley preach on that day was Thomas Rutherford, a youth who ultimately was to become one of Wesley's veterans, but who that day was in a critical and prejudiced frame of mind. It was the first time he had seen or heard Wesley, though he had heard much of the Methodist leader. Rutherford left a record of that first memorable meeting. 'He was in the pulpit when I went into the chapel. His apostolic and angelic appearance struck me exceedingly. He appeared like one come down from heaven to teach men the way thither.' Wesley preached from Hebrews 8:10-13 (a fact not recorded in his *Journal*) and Rutherford says: 'He opened the words in a concise and easy manner, and spoke from them with such perspicuity and simplicity, and, at the same time, with such wisdom and authority, as I never heard before. To me he seemed like one of the apostles going about, confirming the churches. From that part of the text, "For all shall know me from the least to the greatest," he said, "We are ready to suppose, that it should have been from the greatest to the least"; but, after assigning several reasons why it ought not to be so, he showed, in particular, that that was not God's way; that religion had always begun at the least; that it begun there in the days of our Lord, and of his apostles, and spread and ascended with such rapidity, that St Paul tells us, that in his day, there were *saints in Caesar's household*. The same, he observed, was the case in the present great revival of religion in our own land. It began among the least, but, God hath so mightily prospered his work, that now, said he, "We can say, there are saints in Caesar's household!" I, and the friends who accompanied me, returned highly satisfied, and thankful to the Lord, who had given us to see and hear such a venerable and eminent minister of Christ.' A contemporary account of Wesley's preaching which has great interest in the interpretation of Wesley in this day.

Rutherford was born on 2nd June 1752 (old style) at Corzenside Northumberland; his parents were God-fearing Presbyterians, and his father conducted daily family prayers in a home where religion was given first place. Thomas had an impressionable mind and, probably under the influence of his home, he solemnly recorded that from the age of seven to nine years he fell into grievous sin and was led astray by older friends and soon began to do many wicked things, but it is evident that his heart was inclined to righteousness for he began to read the New Testament when he was ten years old and read the Passion story with tears, and wondered at God's love for men. About the same time he attended with his father the sacrament service, which 'appeared to me sacred, solemn, and delightful. I saw a beauty, and felt a pleasure in it, which I could not describe, and longed, above all things, to be a minister, because I thought they were the holiest and happiest men in the world, and sure to go to heaven. The impressions which were made on my mind that day continued for some weeks. I read the Scriptures, particularly the New Testament, with increased delight, and got by heart, several prayers composed for children, by Mr Willison Dundee, which I said in private, morning and evening, with great seriousness and a measure of devotion. Indeed I have no doubt, had I at that time had *an interpreter, one of a thousand*, to have shown me the way to salvation, but I should have embraced it in good earnest, for nothing appeared to me so desirable and important, as to know, love, and serve the Lord.'

Such was the early training of the youth who went to hear Wesley preach at Morpeth and though he did not realize it, presented Wesley with a background to which he could appeal. Perhaps he had gone to hear Wesley because of his previous contacts with Methodists whose activities he suspected, and his relations with them were much akin to that of Paul to the early Christians; there are, in fact, many points of similarity in his spiritual development to that of St Paul. Rutherford first contacted Methodist people in 1767—he was then fifteen years old—when he walked four or five miles to hear a Methodist preacher of the Gospel, Jacob Rowell, preach in a farm-house. Rowell was an eloquent preacher who became well known between Newcastle and Leeds and his remarkable powers of appeal gained for him the name of 'the weeping prophet', and John Wesley said of him, after hearing him preach a Conference sermon: 'What have I been doing? What has my brother Charles been doing? This man will save more souls than both of us.' Rowell deeply moved young Rutherford, though he was still unconvinced of the truth of the Message, and while others praised the sermon he remained silent. 'My breast', he said, 'swelled with prejudice, and glowed with indignation, such as I had never felt before. I determined never to hear them (the Methodists) more. The truth is, I was at that time a poor, ignorant, bigotted Presbyterian. Yet I had often a great desire to serve God and find my way to heaven, but could not bear the Methodists, I looked upon them as deceivers and deceived. From the time I heard them, my prejudice increased, and I more than ever indulged myself in speaking against them, and was pleased when I got others to join with me.' However later the same year he went to hear Rowell again and a message which stressed the need of prayer found a lodging-place in Rutherford's heart, and after that he frequently took opportunity to listen to any Methodist preacher, and one, William Smith, finally brought him to the decision to resolve that if he could not approve their work he would not mock.

His desire for the good life was furthered by reading a book on Regeneration



by Thomas Gouge (ejected from St Sepulchre Church, London, by the Act of Uniformity in 1662), and seeking the company of serious-minded people became acquainted with a Methodist family, evidently by name of Cook, from which five brothers, a sister, and two servants, attended a Methodist Society Class, and though Rutherford put himself on guard against being enticed into joining the Society, he found a happiness of heart and mind that allayed prejudice. The influence of this family cannot be overestimated, and his description of the family life among such people in that day is worthy of quotation, not only as an indication of his state of mind when he went to hear Wesley preach at Morpeth, but as a representative picture of an early Methodist family. 'I had frequent opportunity', he says, 'of being in company with them, both on the Sabbath and other days, and I watched their conduct and conversation very narrowly. For I was apprehensive that they had some secret scheme or trick among them, which they did not at first disclose, and by which the unwary were ensnared. I was therefore very much upon my guard; I said in my heart; "Aye, this is just what I expected. Now, you want to catch me, but I'll take care you shall not." Yet notwithstanding all my prejudice, and all my fears, which were neither small nor few, I could not help seeing that they differed exceedingly from all others in the circle of my acquaintance. On the Sabbath-day, all of them that could, regularly attended church. No conversation was heard among them on that sacred day, about worldly affairs, but what was absolutely necessary. They spent their leisure time in reading the Scriptures, and other religious books, and partly in singing hymns, in prayer, and in conversing on divine and spiritual subjects. On the other days of the week, they were diligent in business; in that respect, none exceeded them, but their spirit and conversation were the same. They appeared to me to pass through and manage all their secular affairs in the very same spirit in which they went to church, heard preaching, read the Scriptures, sang hymns, and poured out their souls in prayer to God. This was all new to me. I had never seen anything like it. And though it did not immediately remove my deep-rooted prejudice, yet it certainly lessened it, and in various respects had a considerable effect upon me. I saw, whatever might be wrong in their principles, that their practice was right; and that they lived as I ought to do, and very differently from those who were saying all manner of evil of them.'

A sermon he heard from William Smith, at the end of the summer of 1768, quickened his heart with the realization that a special word had been spoken to him, and this confirmed his intention to attend the presbyterian sacrament service that year to be held in October. In preparation for this he spent many hours of devotion and prayer in the fields, and with the Cook family attended a Methodist Society-meeting where the singing of 'Jesu, lover of my soul' dispelled some of the fears he had that God would disown him. With fear and trembling he went to the sacrament service, for which he had further prepared himself by reading a devotional book by Matthew Henry on the Sacrament, and found it to be the very gate of heaven at which his fears and distress vanished. In this new-found joy John Cook again became his spiritual guide and mentor by relating to him, as they contemplated God's love in the green fields, what God had done for him, and he was able to tell Rutherford of the day and time and place when God became his Saviour. Still progressing in his pilgrimage Rutherford went to hear William Hunter, preacher of the Gospel, on Christmas Eve and again on Christmas Day, and when

in the evening he went out into the fields to pray a sense of pardon filled his heart and he knew he was accepted of God. The result was that, though some of his friends left him and he was disowned by his own minister for so doing, he joined the Methodist Society at Sweet-Hope in January 1769.

He quickly found a sure place in the Methodist fellowship. At a Love-feast held at Whittington, at which Tyneside Methodists told of their experience of God's dealing with them, young Rutherford stood up and, with much nervous trembling, testified of his experience of God. His earnestness led to his appointment as a Methodist Class Leader on the next visit of the itinerant preacher to his own home town and to him it seemed impossible that he, the youngest person with the shortest standing in time in the Society should become a Leader. Diligently he continued in his office and quickly gained the affection of those who belonged to his Society Class. Their confidence in him was indicated by their request that he should consider assuming the high office of preaching—an honour among Methodists reserved only for those who had proved themselves worthy of the trust of God. Slowly Rutherford had come to the conviction that God had prepared him for some special work, and though at first he shrunk from the office of Preacher, he knew that a suggestion made to him by a member of his Class that he should become a preacher, was the call of God, and he was sure of it when Mr Harrison, a travelling preacher, asked him to do his Circuit work for a few days. On the 13th May 1770, after many inward struggles, he preached his first sermon, or as he says, 'exhorted from a passage of Scripture' for which he was encouraged by those who heard him. He was not yet eighteen years old, and owing to being left an orphan at a very early age, and assuming responsibilities for his family, he had had little schooling and was conscious of his deficiency in learning. He was of such a shy and retiring nature and sensitive, that the neighbours talked about his starting to preach which was, indeed, a brave thing to do. 'Unless the Lord had, in a peculiar manner, stood by and strengthened me,' he said, 'I should have sunk and been utterly confounded, even after I was satisfied that he had called me to the work.' Thus by strange and devious ways in a spiritual pilgrimage, through prejudice and reluctance, a shy and not physically strong young man went to hear John Wesley preach at Morpeth in 1772, and though the *Journal* does not state the fact, Thomas Rutherford, who was later to be closely associated with Wesley, was there.

SATURDAY, 23RD MAY 1772. '*I went to Alnwick.*'

Thomas Rutherford, now an itinerant Preacher in the Connexion of John Wesley, met Wesley on the Road to Berwick and went with him to Alnwick where he spent the sabbath and preached four or five times during the day, and Rutherford was there. Soon after he had exhorted in 1770, Mr Harrison published him as a preacher and he took his first real appointment at a place some twelve miles away from his own home. His friend, John Cook, went with him. It was a memorable day. He rose early and crossing the Tyne met some people on their way to the service who asked him if he knew who the preacher was. 'God help you, you have a poor preacher this morning,' he replied. After the service he was encouraged by George Humble who pleaded with him that, having put his hand to the Gospel plough, he would never look back; and Rutherford, who had now begun to learn the art of preaching, increased in might and power. At one of his early services held near his own home town so many friends and neighbours came that he was

compelled to speak in the open air instead of the barn where it was intended the service should be held. Many were greatly helped by his preaching and were led to seek God, and if his sermons were of the same high standard as his diary they must have been a great joy to hear, and characterized by a deep and wondering sense of devotion combined with an intense spiritual outlook. It is possible still to thrill to his joy as he describes with what wonder he discovered God's world, and of how through prayer and meditation that world was disclosed to him. He seems to have spent many hours in the quietness of green fields, where he frequently recaptured the uplift of heart and soul that became part of his experience at the October sacramental service. One typical passage, from many, gives an indication as to how his disciplined devotional life had become a normal expression of his experience. 'On the Monday evening,' he wrote, 'about sunset, I went out to the fields to meditate and pray. The evening was pleasant and serene: scarce a leaf moved—the face of the sky was without a cloud—night imperceptibly drew her sable curtains around me—the stars twinkled in the heavens—and solemn silence reigned throughout the whole. While I walked to and fro, in a retired corner of a field, secluded from every human eye, surveying the beauty and grandeur of the scene, and contemplating Him, "who meteth out the heavens with a span, measureth the waters in the hollow of his hand, weigheth the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance, and taketh up the isles as a very little thing"; He condescended to give me such a sense of His holiness, His power, His greatness, and infinite Majesty, as did indeed fill me with "that sacred awe which dares not move". I trembled before Him, and was afraid to move in His presence. The heavens, the earth, the fields, the trees,—every spire of grass, and every drop of dew, seemed full of God. He was all in all. I felt surrounded with, and lost in His immensity. A little more would have overwhelmed me, and dissolved nature. After some time, the deep sense of His presence and Majesty was withdrawn, and I returned home, calm, recollected, thankful, and happy, that this glorious God was my God and Father in Christ.'

The Society to which he belonged, when he joined it, was part of the Barnard Castle Circuit, but at the Conference of 1771 it was taken into the Newcastle Circuit and he took the place of a fourth minister who had been appointed but who did not arrive; thus Thomas Rutherford became assistant preacher to Messrs Peter Jaco, William Thompson, and Thomas Simpson, at the Quarterly Meeting held in Newcastle on 1st January 1772, and ten days later started work at Placey as an Itinerant Preacher. In the months that followed he visited Longbenton, Gateshead, Sunderland, and Durham, and was in all places received with affection and given loyal support. In May 1772 he removed to Alnwick, and toward the end of that month went to meet John Wesley to bring the Methodist leader to his circuit, which he certainly would do proudly, yet humbly, for he had become, what in previous years he believed God was calling him to be, a minister of the Gospel, and now he had that affectionate distinction early Methodists gave to their ministers, Preacher of the Gospel.

2ND AUGUST 1772. *'On Sunday evening I preached at Leeds. . . . On TUESDAY 4TH AUGUST our Conference begun. . . .'*

Thomas Rutherford went to the Conference of 1772. Soon he was brought into direct contact with Wesley, and though he was to attend other Conferences at

Leeds in 1775 and 1778, his first Conference left a deep impression on him. He was now an accepted preacher and if he has left no record of any part he took in Conference affairs he did record hearing Wesley preach at the 1772 Conference, to which he went with Peter Jaco. It was an experience he had not expected. 'A favour I had no right to expect,' he said, 'and should not have presumed to ask.' With William Thompson he lodged at the house of one named John Ash, with whom boarded the venerable John Nelson of Methodist fame. That first Conference must have been a rich time of fellowship for the young preacher as he listened to the experiences of those with whom he lodged. 'Their conversation,' he says, 'Concerning the work of God in the beginning, the cruel persecution that the Methodists then suffered, the patience and fortitude with which they endured it, and the manner in which the Lord prospered his work in spite of all opposition, was extremely interesting and affecting to me, who little more than six years had known that there was such a people in the world, and had then been connected with them only about three years and a half.'

He heard Wesley preach to an immense crowd behind the chapel, a sermon in which he described the work God had done among the Methodists, and how it was a growing work. The Conference at which he heard reports from all over the Connexion was 'marrow and fatness' to his soul. The Conference appointed him to the Aberdeen Circuit, which was the beginning of an extensive travel in Scotland, England, Ireland, and the Isle of Man. In his travels he was a faithful minister who cared for his people and so gained the trust and confidence of Wesley that he was named a member of the Legal Hundred in the *Deed of Declaration*, made in 1784, by which Wesley transferred his authority, and the wellbeing of his Connexion, to one hundred chosen and trusted preachers who after his death were to compose the Legal Conference.

WEDNESDAY, 8TH MAY 1776. '*In the evening I preached at Edinburgh and the next evening near the river side at Glasgow. . . .*'

FRIDAY 10TH MAY. '*I went to Greenock. . . .*'

Thomas Rutherford travelled from one Circuit to another, always reluctant to tear himself away from a people he learned to love, and in 1775 he went to superintend the Edinburgh Circuit. He was there on this visit of Wesley (with whom he rode) when he says: 'I went to Greenock.' He was at Glasgow when Wesley came and heard him preach in the evening of arrival and also next morning at five o'clock. Between six and seven Wesley set out for Greenock accompanied by Mr Rogers and Thomas Rutherford and another friend. Rutherford, who says this journey with Wesley was the greatest treat of its kind that he ever enjoyed, and the only occasion when he travelled with him on horseback, has left a vivid description of the ride, which reveals Wesley in his friendly role of an interesting conversationalist. 'As he [Wesley]', Rutherford says, 'could not read or write, as he did when travelling in his carriage, he gave himself up to conversation; which was at once replete with information and entertainment.' The following two Wesley anecdotes are worthy of circulation and are best quoted in the words of Rutherford's record. The first is an indication of Wesley's powers of observation in which no little thing passed him unnoticed, and the second reveals Wesley's missionary interest retained in his own Overseas Missionary Field—an interest that will be understood and appreciated by every returned missionary. 'We had got but a

very little way out of town, when we passed a gentleman's seat. Mr Wesley asked me what was the name of it; but, alas, tho' I had passed it repeatedly, I could not tell. He said: "When I can learn nothing else, I like to learn the names of houses and villages as I pass them." His words carried reproof to my heart, and covered me with shame.'

A circumstance occurred as we rode along, that led him to relate an anecdote, which I shall never forget, and which I thought highly characteristic. We overtook a little girl without stockings and shoes (a thing very common in Scotland in spring and summer); he called her to him, and gave her a shilling, with a few words of advice. He then took notice of the custom, and added, "When I was in America, I taught one school in Savannah, and Mr Delamott taught another. He told me one day, that a part of the boys belonging to his school wore stockings and shoes, and the others did not; and that the former laughed at and ridiculed the latter, and thereby discouraged them; and that, though he prevented their doing so when they were under his eye, they did it when out of school: so that, notwithstanding all the pains he had taken, it appeared to be a growing evil, and he did not know how to cure it. I told him", said Mr Wesley, "I thought I could cure it; and added, 'If you will take care of my school next week, I will take care of yours, and try;' which he readily consented to do. Accordingly, on Monday morning I went into his school without either stockings or shoes. The children looked with surprise, first at me, and then at each other. I took no notice, but kept them to their work. I soon observed, however, that those who were without stockings and shoes, began to gather courage, and look with an air of consequence, now they had the master on their side. I did the same every day during the week; before the end of which, several of those who used to wear stockings and shoes, came to school without them. Thus the evil was securely cured!"' Rutherford gave a wise observation on this method of Wesley and recalled a remark made by Dr Beattie. 'Though this was but a small matter,' he says, 'yet I think none but a person of a great and ready mind would have either thought of, or practised such a way of putting a stop to the evil; nor could any thing be better calculated effectually to answer the end. It reminds me of a remark of the late Dr Beattie, of Aberdeen, after hearing Mr Wesley in that city. Being asked by a gentleman who came with him, what he thought of the sermon, he replied, "It was not a masterly discourse, and yet none but a master could have delivered it".'

Wesley went to the North of Scotland to visit his societies but Rutherford remained behind, probably on account of ill-health, and later visited Dundee and Haddington, perhaps to make arrangements for Wesley's visit to those towns, but when Wesley returned to Edinburgh on 27th May Rutherford spent three days with him. If Rutherford is not directly mentioned by name in the *Journal* he has his place there for he was brought into direct contact with Wesley on his extensive travels throughout the United Kingdom. He was a friend of Wesley, proud to be counted as a preacher of the Gospel, and across a century and a half he still speaks of the refreshing springs of God.

4TH JULY 1781. '*I preached at Louth. . .*'

On 4th July 1781 Wesley married Thomas Rutherford to Isabella Young of Coleraine, and a letter of the same date expressed his good wishes for their happiness, 'Which you cannot fail,' wrote Wesley, 'If you have much holiness; therefore



the certain way to make each other happy is to strengthen each other's hands before God.' Thus begun, under Wesley's blessing, a married life for Rutherford which in company with a wife who shared his work and nursed him in much ill-health, brought him joy and happiness. Wesley wrote many letters to him as one of his itinerant preachers, letters which always began with 'My dear Tommy' and ended 'your affectionate friend and brother'. Those letters reveal Wesley's kindly concern for his preachers; one letter tells of how 'dear Tommy' is to be removed from Londonderry to Lisburn so that his wife could be near her own home during 'her laying in'. In the series of letters, the first of which was on 24th December 1774, Wesley gave advice, sent greeting to Sister Rutherford, and agreed with some action of Rutherford; in fact, there is a kindly charm and intimate consideration of a father for his children in whom there is delight. 'Now, Tommy,' he wrote on 6th December 1776, 'Let us redouble our diligence;' and in a letter of 19th October 1782 he said; 'I allow you to give any books you please to any preacher, to the value of forty shillings.' Not only was Wesley concerned with the spiritual quality of the life of his preachers but, as his letters to Rutherford reveal, he was interested in their domestic life and personal problems and found occasion to comment on the little things, such as his pleasure that 'Dear Tommy' had found the Isle of Man a congenial place in which to live and work.

Thomas Rutherford, friend of Wesley, on account of ill-health was retired in 1795, after thirty-four years of a distinguished ministry in which he showed considerable ability. He died on 20th April 1806, at the age of fifty-five, declaring, 'He has, indeed, been a precious Christ to me, and now I feel Him to be my rock, my strength, my rest, my hope, my joy, my all in all' words that are truly placed in the good company of John Wesley, across the pages of whose *Journal* he sheds a light.

FREDERICK PILKINGTON

---

*Continued from page 262*

<sup>1</sup> References in the *Journal* are too numerous to mention; these are only a few, out of very many, examples.

<sup>2</sup> John R. Green, *Short History of the English People*.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters*, V.134. Was blindness so prevalent in Ireland?—this is a shrewd observation!

<sup>4</sup> *Works*, IX.224—the Treatise is dated 1756.

<sup>5</sup> For Wesley's opinion of the Irish language, see *Journal* for 18th May 1785: 'It is . . . beyond all comparison, worse than any ancient language I know anything of . . . or any other modern language.' Wesley had a good knowledge of languages.

<sup>6</sup> Tract of this title, *Works*, X.129-33.

<sup>7</sup> Phillips, W. A., *History of the Church of Ireland*, III.183.

<sup>8</sup> *ibid.*, p. 286, quoting Bishop Mant.

<sup>9</sup> But see Section VI, *infra*.

<sup>10</sup> Henry Grey Graham, *Social Life in Scotland in the Eighteenth Century*, p. 272.

<sup>11</sup> Charles Wesley in his *Journal* spells 'Millar'.

<sup>12</sup> For whether William Tucker was with him, see the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* (I.68).

<sup>13</sup> The full title is '*Experience and Spiritual Letters of Mrs Hester Ann Rogers, by herself, her husband and Dr Coke.*' (Published in 1840 by Mason: London.)

## THE PRESENT-DAY PROPHET

*The Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel (Amos 7:11).*

WHEN, following the tale of man from the beginning, we come to Amos, we catch our breath; for here, in a most unlikely corner, among a small and relatively backward people, is the first identifiable great prophet, the beginner of a Hebrew line that has no parallel anywhere or anywhen. The proof of his greatness is that across an immense gulf of time and culture his words still come through; we can listen to them even now with profitable discomfort, with the pain that is fitting when sinful men recognize that they are being addressed by the righteous God.

How simply Amos describes his call! 'The Lord took me as I followed the flock'. The Hebrew word translated 'took' is the ordinary one, leaving no room for the commentator to get out of it a picturesque meaning. Amos does not dramatize either his call or his calling: he records it with plain objectivity, as though it were entirely normal, the most natural thing in the world, to be met and got hold of by the Lord—which is a proof that he was more at home with God than we are, who are astonished by a divine visitation, remember our feelings rather than Him that caused them, and record the experience with subjectivist rhetoric. In an age that drags the private into the open and shouts exaggerations we shall probably rebuke and teach it more if we couch *our* testimony in Amos's simple way: 'The Lord took me as I was at the desk, the counter, the bench, the coal-face.'

Amos tells us not how he felt, but what the Lord told him to do. 'Go, prophesy unto my people.' It was this command that originated and validated his mission, changing him from a shepherd into the Amos of Holy Writ. 'I was no prophet,' he replied to the priest who tried to dismiss him, 'neither was I one of the sons of the prophets.' Revelation, he was in effect saying, cannot be confined to official or conventional channels: God seeks out whom He will, and speaks through him. What God then wanted most, and what men needed most, was not the priest but the prophet; and the prophet is a man whom God has taken.

The command to prophesy still comes. We evangelicals would say that now it constitutes the minister. Of course, a minister has other things to do, but that one thing is his central and indefeasible task. If we admit this in theory we deny it in practice, for a minister has nowadays *so many* other things to do that that one thing tends to be crowded out. Little wonder that preaching has lost the prophetic note, the light and power that come manifestly from above, the accent of God's own voice. We lay folk must assume responsibility for the loss, so far as it is we that encumber our ministers with many and varied demands.

To be able to prophesy, a man must spend long hours with God. He must tire his knees in private before he can stand up in public; he must listen before he can speak; he must grow full and warm before he can erupt. How much chance do we give our ministers for this receiving of the Spirit, for those secret unveilings and delights and agonies that enable and entitle them to stride into the pulpit and abash or exalt us? Possibly not every minister has the making of a prophet. If so, let us plan to have ministers of both kinds in every Circuit, in order to ensure that the voice of prophecy shall be nowhere and never silent. But it would show

Address given at the Annual Commemoration Service, Hartley Victoria College, 4th June, 1953.

more faith in God, and be more compatible with our belief in the priesthood of all believers, if we lay folk relieved ministers of some of their activities and left them more time to fit themselves to prophesy.

What is prophecy? Telling forth the mind of God. Therefore it is as varied as that mind. It has no one topic and no one manner. We are both narrowing God's mind and playing a theatrical part if we think that we are being prophetic only when, like Amos, we blaze out the divine wrath at social injustice. Even while Amos was speaking God had taken another man, Hosea, to speak in another way, still to shame His people but in a quieter tone. We see Isaiah taken in the Court, have another type in the shy but brave Jeremiah, and yet another in the wonderful prophet of the Return. When we step out of the Old Testament into the New we are ushered quickly from the Baptist, who is almost another Amos, to the greatest of them all, for in His human aspect our Lord was a prophet, the end and culmination of the Hebrew line.

We are to mimic none of these, but to do what they did—wait on God and then speak from the resulting intimacy. Nor are we to copy a prophet alive today, Karl Barth, since we have not behind us the Calvinist-Lutheran theology, or immediately before us the apocalyptic ruin of a mighty nation, or all round us the proud faith in gigantic philosophical constructions, that make that powerful preacher appropriate in his German situation. All copying is a second-hand affair, and it is the essence of prophecy that it be first-hand.

Prophecy, then, is various. The prophet must sometimes hurt, but always in sorrow. He must censure, but never with satisfaction. He must instruct, but without pride. He must also comfort, but not so as to leave the impression that religion is simply a comfortable thing. There is no one note in prophecy, and no one instrument that plays it best. In the divine music there is an octave of notes, or rather octave upon octave. The prophet rises and falls through such ranges as he has heard, and speaks in the manner he has heard—sometimes like an organ, sometimes as sweetly as a harp, sometimes like a muted string, and sometimes with no musical art, as when he walks beside a brother and in quiet conversation leads him away from his eyes and ears to where his soul belongs.

Is prophecy wholly spontaneous? No. We have to learn both the content and the way. The urge to prophesy does not carry with it the ability to prophesy.

In this matter we evangelicals are specially prone to the sin of impatience, and to the near-blasphe-my of mistaking any excitement for inspiration, and any warmly-felt idea for a revelation. The Anglicans of the eighteenth century who recoiled from what they called our 'enthusiasm' were not without justification. They saw garish flashes pretending to come from the inner light; they heard men declare as from God what was patently personal opinion, or heresy, or solemn nonsense; they were repelled by a familiarity with God that had lost the awe which becomes even the redeemed; they recognized the sophistries and diseases that tend to beset the religiously zealous soul. So also, of course, did the leaders of the evangelicals themselves, among them our own austere John Wesley. They were aware, as we should be, that from the early Church downwards there have been facile prophets as well as false ones, and that the former have done at least as much as the latter to bring prophecy into disrepute.

Let us, then, have the humility to learn. How? First and foremost by much waiting on God. This is why a theological college must have a chapel, and why a



preacher's study should be also his oratory. On that nothing more need here be said. In this place, and on this occasion, the question to be considered is rather why a chapel should have a theological college, and why a preacher's oratory should also be his study. Why, when the call to prophesy comes, do we need anything more than what is supplied directly by grace?

The answer has not to be spun out of the air, but drawn from experience. It is a fact of the Christian past that, with rare exceptions, grace alone has not been sufficient for the effective proclamation of God's mind. The reason is simple, namely, that in His natural order of creation God has given us certain faculties, which have an irreplaceable use. What we *can* do with them we *should* do, instead of seeking supernatural short-cuts. We don't see and hear by grace, because we don't need to, having eyes and ears. To expect to remember by grace instead of doing some hard memorizing is to hide a natural talent and to find a high-sounding excuse for mental laziness. There is nothing Pelagian in these observations, for to say that even for prophecy grace alone is not enough is not to deny the divine initiative, but simply to recognize that in this life the natural and the supernatural are inseparably intertwined. The function of grace, it seems, is to expand and supplement, not to cancel and replace.

Let us face this business of study, as a natural necessity for the higher business of prophecy. A few illustrations should suffice to bring the point home.

*First*, the vehicle of prophecy is language. If the language is inept the message is weakened, distorted, or left unintelligible. The prophet must therefore be master of his mother-tongue. Now the ability to use English simple enough to enlighten and strong enough to move any congregation, and at the same time big enough to express the mind of God, is not the gift of grace but the reward of study. Grace cleanses our speech; it does not supply it.

*Secondly*, why grind at Hebrew, or Greek, or both? Because the Bible was not written in English, and because no language can be translated perfectly into another. It follows that to wring the last drop of meaning from the sacred texts some knowledge of the original is required. But surely, you may object, the *English* Bible is sufficient for salvation. Of course it is, but that is beside the point. We are considering not what the private reader of the Bible can manage with, but what is needed by the public expositor of it. True, there may be prophets unlearned in the ancient tongues, but they can prophesy, can preach with truth, variety and power, only spasmodically. Those who are separated from the community as full-time prophets, to prophesy at least every Sunday for the whole of their adult lives, need as much knowledge of the original texts as the remaining fields of needful study leave them time for.

It has been said that Hebrew is the language of heaven. If so, Greek is its second tongue. Yet in the providence of God neither of them comes to us by revelation but only by strenuous study. And students need teachers, and students and teachers regularly together make a college, which a Church must willingly found and willingly support.

*Thirdly*, why theology? Hebrew and Greek are keys to the inner sanctuary; English is what we have to use when we come forth from the sanctuary to tell people what we have found there; and what is to be found there is, in one sense of the word, theology, that is, the truth about God. Well, isn't that simply received on our knees, the only posture appropriate there? It is. But are we not then to check

and enlarge this secret revelation by what has been revealed to others there? And are we not to pay it the tribute of thinking hard about it, to bring it to clear and ordered expression and to unpack its manifold implications? And are we not to draw on the thinking as well as the experience of the whole Christian past? And are we not withal to compare it with our natural knowledge, for the purgation and enrichment of both? If we are, we are committed to the learning of theology in its technical sense—biblical, historical, systematic, philosophical, and experimental.

Remember again that we are reflecting on the needs not of the Christian as such but on the prophetic preacher of Christianity. The Methodist saying that you must not preach theology is intolerable, unless it means merely that you must cut out the technicalities of the theology-course. With this qualification the truth surely is that there is little else to preach except theology, if the preaching is to be prophetic.

For those who are impatient to become prophets the discipline of theology—the kind that has to be *studied*—has two specially suitable virtues. On the one hand, it will school their utterances, keeping them both from threadbare thinness and from the flashy plausibilities that hide long-exposed heresies. On the other hand, it will tether their main interest to an outer, transcendent, objective centre. It will make their thinking theocentric. It will bend them to talk rarely about themselves, a little more about other people, and most of all about God, and thereby to set forth religion as the due worship and service of the Perfect Lord, and only secondarily as the satisfaction of certain human needs.

These three illustrations of the point that prophecy must be learned will be enough to suggest further ones. When we have taken stock of the equipment needed by a present-day prophet we shall conclude not only that a college course is necessary but also that the end of the course is but the beginning of learning.

We started from Amos. How shall we end? By reminding ourselves that we are more blessed than he. We have a bigger God to preach, a God more fully self-revealed. We have a more intelligible God to preach, since He has revealed Himself in concrete form in Jesus. And we live under a new dispensation, in which the grace of God in Christ gives us both redemption and the sense of it. In short, there is more to preach, and there are more reasons for preaching it. Therefore the word of the Lord to Amos, 'Go, prophesy,' has even more force for us than it had for him. We shall have spent this celebration well if, before we disperse, the students and ministers among us resolve afresh to prophesy and to tread the long road of preparation, and if the rest of us resolve, first, to make it possible for them to do so, and, secondly, when they do so, to give them heed. Then the grace of God will be richly on us all.

T. E. JESSOP

---

## OUR PROTESTANT HERITAGE

WE DISTINGUISH between *heritage* and *inheritance*. If I were concerned in this paper with the Protestant inheritance, I should try to add (quite superfluously) to what innumerable scholars have said about the Bible, for the Bible is the Protestant inheritance; any other inheritance that we recognize as Protestant having been derived, directly or indirectly, from the Bible. Our *heritage* is a spiritual possession; it is derived from the divine in human nature. It is freedom as exhibited in private judgement. It is intimately, though not necessarily, connected with our inheritance, for it was through study of the Bible that our fathers secured freedom, freedom to think and to express their thoughts. Freedom was in their bones, but it might have lain there dormant for generations, had not Bible readers and Bible hearers in the early sixteenth century been led to compare the spirituality of the Gospel with the mechanized Christianity of Rome. It is true that the Reformers substituted rigid systems of faith and order for those which they rejected, but, intentionally or otherwise, they left a loop-hole for freedom. The Bible remained an open book. The Reformers interpreted it after their fashion, and their interpretation was no doubt accepted by the majority of Protestants; but the book in which, as has been said, everyone looked for his dogmas, and found them, was certain, soon or late, to become a menace to Orthodoxy.

Heresy was met at first by persecution. In Edward the Sixth's reign Joan Bouchier was burnt for opinions similar to those for which Servetus suffered soon after at Geneva. Toleration of heresy was regarded as no better than heresy itself. The reformed Churches, wiser in their own conceit than their Master, believed that the only way to deal with tares was to destroy them at their first appearance. Jesus had advised his hearers to let the tares and the wheat grow together till the harvest, so that the tares might be removed without damaging the wheat; but the Churches, bedevilled by the doctrine of original sin, distrusted human nature and therefore chose terror instead of kindness as their ally. They rooted up what they regarded as tares, even though they had to take human life in doing so. Shakespeare's Brutus wished he could come by Caesar's spirit without dismembering Caesar, but the Churches do not seem to have worried much about the impossibility of such an operation. The unreformed Church had been dismembering opponents for centuries—violently separating soul and body—and the reformed Churches followed the bad example.

Appreciation of relative values, or, if you like, a sense of the ridiculous, is not an outstanding characteristic of zealous innovators. Erasmus had that sense, but Erasmus died in outward conformity with the Roman Church. Having no desire for martyrdom, he kept at a safe distance from the fanatics of both camps, and died in his bed. His friend More was less lucky. He was by nature humane, and had he been able to live in Utopia, he might have been remembered as an apostle of toleration. Listening to Hythlodaye's description of Utopia he had not been offended by the State's toleration of religious differences, but in England he condemned heretics to death without, apparently, doing violence to his conscience. In the opinion of Henry Hallam, More had 'a very ingenious rather than a profound mind', and being a man of 'very quick parts', was 'not very retentive of his opinions'. Of some opinions he was certainly extraordinarily retentive: he believed in the supreme authority of the Roman Church, and he died maintaining that belief.

Even in Utopia, I think, he would have been as severe as he was in England, if Utopia's religious history had been similar to England's. But Utopia had never had a Pope. In early times religion there had been any man's guess, and when Raphael Hythlodaye visited the country, the Utopians had only begun 'by little and little to forsake and fall from [a] variety of superstitions, and to agree together in that religion which seemed by reason to pass and excel the residue'. They were groping for truth, and in such circumstances religious toleration would probably have been innocent, perhaps necessary; but if the Utopians had once accepted Romanism, as they seemed inclined to do while Hythlodaye was with them, non-conformity on their part would have had as little sympathy from Sir Thomas More as it had from him in England.

If More, the kindly family man, could condemn heretics to death, it is no wonder that in the small sixteenth-century universe, Reformers who are remembered as theologians rather than as Christians, logicians rather than as humanists, should have been persecutors. It is true that, as Hallam remarks, 'the crime of persecution assumes', in the Reformers, 'a far deeper hue, and is capable of far less extenuation, than in a Roman inquisitor'. The Reformers who persecuted were men who themselves had 'hardly escaped' from persecution; 'who had nothing to plead but the right of private judgement, [and] who had defied the prescriptive authority of past ages and of established power'. True indeed; but the Reformers were engaged in a life-and-death struggle, and in such situations intellectual modesty and a sense of the fitness of things cease to restrain the barbarous logic of fear. If they had been Erasmuses, they would not have persecuted, but they would not have broken with Rome either. Fortunately for us moderns, their imitation of Roman discipline was, in most cases, feeble compared with the original, and the Bible which had made them rebels against Rome kept on making more Protestant eccentrics than they could deal with.

It was to non-conforming Protestants that the English State Church, following the lines laid down by the daughter of Anne Boleyn, turned its chief attention. It left heretics to their Maker. The typical religion of the English may be described as positivism against a background of theism. The English do not take kindly to theology, but they are something more than tolerant of religious observances. They enjoy them. Their faith may be much more tenuous than its expression in the official summaries, but their sense of public order is strong. They are individualists, but they are not easily tempted, by zeal or vanity, to leave the herd. Those who do leave it must expect rough handling, by the mob as well as by the authorities, till they have proved their toughness. *Egregius* was an epithet of honour among the old Romans; the modern form of the word is one which none of us would welcome as descriptive of himself or of anyone he cared for.

It was well for England (and therefore for those vast regions whose populations were to learn from England's example and precept how to be at once free and orderly) that Tudor rule came to an end when it did. The dangers which threatened the country from almost all sides during the greater part of Elizabeth's reign united the nation and kept the marprelates and other uneasy persons within narrow bounds; but a continuance of Tudor rule after the external menace had been removed might have brought about a sham uniformity ending (as it has ended in other countries) in revolution and a totalitarian régime.

Under the Stuarts, popular discontent led to a civil war which was so hardly

won that the victors were driven far in the direction of despotism during Cromwell's last years and all parties were glad to accept a Stuart restoration.

The Royalists came back to power, but they had to exercise it through Parliament. Absolutism had been broken for good, and the tyranny of prelates was little more than a memory. The object lesson which the new king got as he passed the Cromwellian army on his way to London was not forgotten; Charles knew that his return had been due to a tacit agreement, and he took care to keep the agreement; he had no desire to go on his travels again. The new rulers satisfied their longing for vengeance on the bodies, dead and alive, of regicides and other prominent enemies, and relieved their fears of the rest by laws devised to humiliate and reduce them to political impotence. Knowledge, the Royalists knew, was power, and awareness of the fact may have been among their motives for excluding Nonconformists from the universities; but angry men take short views, and in imposing on their enemies this and other disabilities, we may take it that the Royalists' chief motive was much the same as that which has brought *apartheid* into South African politics. Something like caste was reintroduced into England—this time, by Parliamentary means. Classes there had always been, but the division of the population into Church of England adherents and sectaries was in essence, if not otherwise, similar to that which for generations had separated Normans and English.

Traces of caste still exist, and it is no wonder that they do. The exclusion of Nonconformists from Oxford and Cambridge lasted till 1871. In 1888, James Martineau, recipient in that year of an honorary degree from Oxford, described to the historian Lecky, who on the same day had been similarly honoured, the feeling of frustration aroused in him sixty-six years earlier by the University's banning of Dissenters. For higher education he had had to go to Manchester New College (with which, as things turned out, he was connected, as professor and principal, from the year 1840 to 1885). Dr Arnold, who was before his time in so many respects, advocated, as early as 1834, the admission of Dissenters to the universities; he would even have admitted Unitarians, provided that they attended halls of their own, or, if such halls did not exist, attended college chapel and divinity lectures. Not many of the Martineau breed, we may be sure, would have been among these.

The exclusion of Nonconformists from Oxford and Cambridge was a ridiculous anachronism which, however, did not indicate any national indifference to the Protestant heritage. Members of the universities were no doubt as little tempted as members of the peerage would be to question the justice of the arrangements to which they owed their position. And, in any case, their power to alter the arrangements was negligible; to open the doors of the universities needed the sanction of Parliament. The Nonconformists, for their part, did not waste energy in vain lamentation: they made money; they built schools and colleges; and so, when the folly of the second James had (as Dr Trevelyan says) 'transformed the citadel of non-resistance and divine right into a rebel town that flew the Orange colours in the High Street', they were able to meet the Churchmen on something like an equal footing.

Their treatment by Churchmen in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was really little more than a hang-over from the ferocity of the seventeenth. Even in that century new interests were beginning to divert public attention from liturgical anomalies. A ninth wave was bringing in unlooked-for wonders. Kepler had dis-



covered law in the movements of the planets, and Galileo was doing for the Copernican doctrine what T. H. Huxley and Haeckel did for Darwinism. It was the century of Descartes, of Pascal, of Robert Boyle, of Huygens, of Newton—the century of genius, as Professor Whitehead called it.

*Nature and Nature's laws lay hid in night:  
God said, Let Newton be! and all was light.*

Newton, however, left plenty of darkness for his successors to dissipate. The more light, the more darkness visible. Alexander Pope, brought up believing without question the creeds of the Roman Church, ran no risk of mental confusion in the Newtonian universe: the new facts would in time be shown to be *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*; but English Churchmen and Nonconformists were otherwise affected. The majority no doubt accepted both Newton and the creeds, but a minority found it much easier to accept Newton's findings than the conclusions of the early Church. Religious foundations were threatened, and Churchmen and Nonconformists, impelled by fear if not by love, began to recognize one another and even to co-operate. They had in common the Protestant inheritance, the Bible, which freedom of interpretation—the Protestant heritage—permitted them to re-examine. Familiarity with the greatest religious literature in the world may not have strengthened the authority of the Creeds, but it has kept alive the sense of the divine in nature, and has saved millions from the vulgarity of materialism.

H. R. CHILLINGWORTH

---

## THE SECOND ATTACK ON THE ENGLISH STAGE

### Preliminary Skirmishes

MORE THAN her sister arts the drama has throughout her history been a centre of controversy, liable to attack by Government, magistrate, and moralist. Twice during the seventeenth century in England, storms of disapproval beat upon the theatre. The earlier outbreak during the Puritan régime is the more familiar, and has undeservedly overshadowed the more vocal and comprehensive controversy after the Protestant Revolution of 1688.

This Revolution changed the status of the dramatists' constituency. The period of experiment after the return of the Stuart Court came acutely into conflict with the reaction toward stability consequent on the arrival of the Whig King William. The political insecurity following the Revolution inevitably led to repressive measures against experiment, and any Stuart flavour was naturally suspect.

One of the casualties in the year of the Revolution was to be a leading campaigner against the stage. The Reverend Jeremy Collier, who had come up to London as a lecturer of Gray's Inn three years previously, was a Jacobite non-juror, committed to Newgate for writing the tract, *The Desertion discuss'd in a Letter to a Country Gentleman*, answering Bishop Burnet's defence of William the Third. After some months in prison he was released without trial by the intervention of friends. In 1692 he was in prison again, having refused bail, for supporting James the Second.

Meanwhile, in 1689, the Master of the Revels asserted his authority by issuing a notice on 4th April that 'all stage-players, mountebanks, rope-dancers and others who show motions and strange sights, do repair to Charles Killigrew, Esq., Master of the Revels, at his office at Somerset House, to renew their licences, the former being void; and that none do presume to make any public show in the town or country without a new licence from the said Master of the Revels'.<sup>1</sup>

In 1693, the year of Mary's death, appeared Rymer's *Short View of Tragedy*, and there can be little doubt that Collier was influenced by this work. It is interesting and ironical to note that Rymer closes with this sentence: 'And yet for modern comedy, doubtless our English are the best in the world.' This sentence was penned in the year of Congreve's first play, 'The Old Bachelor', in which the keynote to Congreve is struck by Araminta: 'Nay, come, I find we are growing serious, and then we are in great danger of being dull' (Act 11, Sc.8).

Powerful elements in the Established Church seem to have been at least not hostile to the stage. In this same year 1693, in the funeral sermon on Queen Mary, Dr Payne praised her Majesty for her love of play-going 'and other gentle amusements. When we recollect what comedies the Queen is known to have seen and commended, the elegiacal reflection of the divine seems a little startling.'<sup>2</sup>

In the same year appeared a work by John Dennis, who was destined to play a prominent part in the stage controversy. *The Impartial Critick* takes the form of a dialogue between Freeman and Beaumont on Rymer's *Short View of Tragedy*. In particular the conversation, assuming that the theatre is the 'School of Virtue', centres round the topic how best that function may be discharged. Beaumont desiderates a Chorus, which can deliver moral sentiments and reflect upon 'what is vicious and commendable in the Characters of the primary Actors'. These latter,

shaken with violent passions, lack the serenity requisite for such reflections. 'There may be a necessity sometimes for their speaking prophanely and impiously, which may be of dangerous consequence, without the reflections of the Chorus.'

In well-written tragedy, contends Freeman, each character immediately discovers his type, 'then if anything is said impiously, an Audience not only knows that it is spoken by an impious Man, but by one that is upon the Point of being punish't for his Impiety'. Tragedy fulfils the function of the stage as a school of virtue because it 'removes the greatest obstructions to Vertue, by reducing the Passions to a just mediocrity from their violence and irregularity', and because it inculcates 'some Moral Doctrine by the Fable, which must always be allegorical and universal'.

The changed attitude of the Court is made apparent in the same year by the Queen's support of the Justices of Middlesex in 'the care they had used to put the laws in execution against prophaneness and debauchery'.<sup>8</sup> This was recorded by Luttrell on Thursday, 18th May. The same diarist thought worthy of note the fact that on 17th June following, 'the grand jury for London . . . made a presentment against the singers and sellers of ballads; against all lotteries and gaming-houses, and against the taverns and alehouses that open doors on Sunday'.

Isolated allegations of indecency begin to be levelled against the stage. In 1694, J. Wright's *Country Conversations*, in a section 'Of Modern Comedies', complains that 'most of our New Comedies are become the very Pictures of Immorality'. The charge is tossed, in the dialectic so fashionable at the time among critics, between Lisander, Mitis, and Julio. The first-named offers a recipe for a comedy concocted from the common characters of contemporary comedy. First, take two young debauchees: 'the Bottle and the Miss . . . make their Summum Bonum.' Second, let them marry two young ladies, one of whom is forward and the other reserved, but sly. Add a foolish knight, who in the last act marries the cast-off whore of one of the debauchees, with his elderly wife who is 'liquorish' after one of the gallants. This husband keeps the whore but rails against the institution of marriage in general and his wife's nagging in particular.

These, asserts Lisander, are the common elements in comedies. The only marks of differentiation consist of tricks and 'kickshaws' which soon become fusty. Another complaint is that goodness is never rewarded, while the debauchee is always the successful gentleman.

Mitis then appeals to the dictum that the business of comedy is to delight, not to instruct. Lisander's reply reveals the same assumptions as Dennis's: 'The True End of Comedy, as well as Tragedy, ought to be the Reformation of Manners, tho' they differ in the Operation.'

As yet, he concedes, plainly obscene actions and immodest expressions are not used on the stage, though how long this respite will be enjoyed is hard to judge. Already '*le double entendre*' is too prevalent.

Disrespect to the clergy does not directly concern him, but he reminds us of the Statute 3 Jac. 1 against profanity. Mitis chaffs him as a relative of 'Prin' and of 'Histriomastix', but Lisander maintains that his strictures are not motivated by Puritan sourness, but issue from his love of the stage, which he would see regulated. In support of this plea he cites the example of the Greek and Roman official attitude, and also that of Richelieu in France.

In 1694 there was a quarrel between the management and the actors at the Drury

Lane Theatre Royal. The terms of disagreement concern the status, pay, and conditions of work of the players. Betterton departed and took over the Lincoln's Inn Fields building, which had been previously re-converted to a tennis-court.<sup>4</sup> Such internal squabbles could not but weaken the cause of the drama, and acted from within. They are contributory factors to the decline of the drama in the next century which must not be neglected.

The most comprehensive indictment since the 1688 Revolution was prefaced by Sir Richard Blackmore to his play 'Prince Arthur' in 1695. Poetic Drama is his theme; the purpose of poetry is 'by universal Confession, the Instruction of our Minds and the Regulation of our Manners';<sup>5</sup> it aims to promote 'the publick Good of Mankind'. But average palates demand an artistic sugar-coating to this moral pill. 'Man is naturally a lover of Pleasure, and if you would do him good, it must be by pleasing him'. For queasy stomachs the purgative must be gently administered by 'the Delicacy of its Strains, the Sweetness and Harmony of its Numbers . . . and the wonderful Force of its Eloquence'. This purpose in the drama is common to tragedy and comedy, the difference between them being that 'Tragedy is designed to Scare Men, Comedy to Laugh them out of their Vices'. To delight is but 'a subordinate, subaltern End'.

From this standpoint Blackmore censures contemporary poets and dramatists. Those whose wit 'is altogether unuseful' are reproached. Those whose wit is used 'in Opposition to Religion, and to the Destruction of Virtue and good Manners in the World' are condemned. There have always been such ill men, 'but never so many, or so bold or mischievous, as in ours.' They are arraigned on charges anticipating Collier. The hero is a libertine, the heroine is immodest, the clergy are abused, and morality is ridiculed. The dramatists' excuse is that their chief business is to please, that the audience calls their tune, and that, therefore, 'the Degeneracy of the Age makes their leud way of Writing necessary'.

As if anticipating Blackmore's plea, Colley Cibber had a suitable play, 'Love's Last Shift, or The Fool in Fashion', produced this same year at Drury Lane!<sup>6</sup>

On 30th April 1695 Betterton re-opened the theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields with Congreve's play, 'Love for Love', which was written in the same year. In a letter to Dennis, dated 10th July 1695, Congreve hazarded critical distinctions between humour, habit, and affectation. 'Humour is from Nature, Habit from Custom, and Affectation from Industry. Humour shews us as we are. Habit shews us as we appear under a forcible Impression. Affectation shews what we would be under a Voluntary Disguise.' It is interesting to note the mutual respect of a playwright and a critic who were to take such conspicuous part in the controversy already embryonic. The critical assumptions and definitions reveal both the competence and the bias of two stage-defenders. One statement is significant for the later debate, in that it offers a practical justification for exaggeration: 'The distance of the Stage requires the Figure represented to be something larger than the Life.'

Protests from another quarter are recorded by Luttrell on 26th October, 1695. Those inhabiting the neighbourhood of the new playhouse in Lincoln's Inn Fields drew up a list of inconveniences occasioned thereby, and petitioned the court of King's Bench that acting might be prohibited. 'The court made two points; first, whether the playhouses in general be not nuisances in themselves; second, admitting they were not, whether the inconveniences aforesaid do not make the new

playhouse become a nuisance to the neighbourhood; and the debate is adjourned untill Thursday.' There is no reference to the conclusion of this case on the Thursday, but this is not remarkable, since before about 1750 many law cases never reached their conclusion, and no comprehensive official records were kept. David Erskine Baker mentions these proceedings against the L.I.F. theatre and comments: 'The event of this law-suit can only be conjectured from the Company's being permitted to act until their removal to the Haymarket.'

Between the years 1693 and 1695 Luttrell records many disturbances of the peace—duels, Jacobite riots, suicide, and coin-clipping either in theatres or by actors. There can be little doubt that this aspect of the theatre as a rendezvous for anti-social individuals and groups was powerful in influencing public opinion unfavourably toward all that was connected with it, whether companies, audiences, or the drama itself.

In 1696, however, Collier, who was to be the stormy petrel of the theatre in three years' time, became a figure of public interest because of his connexion with the Jacobite plots. Together with two other clergy, Cook and Snatt, he granted absolution on the scaffold to Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkyns, who were to be executed for their attempt to assassinate William the Third. For this Collier was sentenced as an outlaw on Saturday 4th April, but scrupling at bail, he absconded, returning to London when excitement had died down. On Thursday 16th April the Bishops declared the non-jurors 'schismatical', seditious, and dangerous. The same day Luttrell records that 'Mr Collier, one of the absolving parsons, has privately printed his vindication'.

The following year, on 5th June, the Lord Chamberlain ordered that no plays were to be performed without his secretary's perusal, 'several new plays having been lately acted, contrary to good manners'. While these plays are not specified, two of Vanbrugh's were written in 1696-7, 'The Relapse' and 'The Provoked Wife', plays and author both being specified later by Collier in his attack. On 24th August the Lord Mayor published an order forbidding gaming and profanity at Bartholomew's Fair.

In this same year, 1697, Sir Richard Blackmore again made his complaints against the contemporary drama in his preface to another poetic play, 'King Arthur'. The mutterings of moral thunder in influential places become more distinct. After the Peace of Ryswick the Government was better able to attend to these complaints at home.

The rumblings of the approaching storm reverberate in Parliament. Both in the Commons and the Lords, with the sympathy of the King, a campaign begins against immorality and profanity in all its forms. An increasing amount of time is given to this consideration in 1698. Especially in February of this year Luttrell's diary is full of references.

On Thursday 10th February, 'the commons ordered an address to his majestie to suppresse prophanenesse and immorality and Socinian books'.

On Tuesday 15th February, 'the addresse against prophanenesse and immorality was reported and agreed to be presented by the whole house to his majestie'.

On Thursday 17th February, the house took the address, 'the substance of which is to desire his majestie to issue out his proclamation, commanding all judges, justices of the peace, and other magistrates, to putt in execution the laws against prophanenesse and immorality, giving due encouragement to all such as shall doe



their duty therein . . . and that the said proclamation be read 4 times a year in all churches, at the assizes and quarter sessions'.

The entry for Saturday 19th February, contains the King's answer: 'Gentlemen, I cannot but be very well-pleased with an addresse of this nature, and will give immediate directions in the several particulars you desire. . . .'

Meanwhile, six days previously, the Reverend Samuel Wesley, father of John Wesley, had preached at St James's Church, Westminster (and afterwards at St Bride's, to one of the Religious Societies), 'A Sermon concerning the Reformation of Manners', from the text: 'Who will rise up for me against the evil doers, or who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?' (Psalm 94, verse 16). After dealing with the subject in general, the preacher proceeds to specific instances, reproving first those who encourage vice by a 'voluntary intimacy' with vicious men, particularly in the Societies who 'for some years last past enter'd into a sworn conspiracy against Religion and Virtue. . . . There scarce seems any need to explain myself, that hereby I mean our infamous Theatres, which seem to have done more mischief than Hobes himself or our new Atheistical Clubs, to the Faith and Morals of the Nation. . . . Moral Representations are own'd to be in their own Nature, not only Innocent, but even useful as well as pleasant.' Like the Early Church Fathers, he ranks the plays with idolatry. He does not mince words in comminatory description: 'Schools of Vice, and Nurseries of Profaneness and Lewdness', and 'Pesthouse . . . infected with any contagion and deadly Disease'. Would any self-respecting person allow himself, his friend, or his child, to go? 'Tis true the Stage pretends to reform Manners, but let them tell us how many converts they can name.' Wesley then proceeds to belabour the plays on the same grounds as Jeremy Collier is about to reveal, that they make virtue ridiculous, and so on. He recommends the giving of information to the magistrates.

On Thursday 24th February the Archbishop of Canterbury brought in a bill against blasphemy, etc., 'and to punish the printers of scandalous books and pamphlets against our religion and government'. And the following day the Lords read a second time the bill against profanity.

On the night of Tuesday 1st March, came out the King's proclamation for punishing immorality and profanity, and by Saturday 5th March the Middlesex magistrates had made an order 'that the constables goe to all publick houses to caution them to observe his majesties proclamation against prophanenesse'.

The same date, 5th March, is attached to Jeremy Collier's preface to *A Short View of the Immorality and Prophanesne of the Stage*, which was issued only a few days later. Collier had seized the opportunity to canalize this ardour for a reformation of manners, and direct it toward the stage in particular. Dennis tells us that the volume 'was conceived, disposed, transcribed, and printed in a month', which fact supports the view that Collier had taken the chance afforded by the debates in Parliament concerning profanity to indict the stage as a special object of this general attack.

T. D. MEADLEY

<sup>1</sup> P. Fitzgerald, *A New History of the English Stage* (1882), I.192.

<sup>2</sup> E. Gosse, *Life of William Congreve* (1888), p. 97.

<sup>3</sup> N. Luttrell, *Brief Relation of State Affairs* (1678-1714).

<sup>4</sup> C. W. Heckethorn, *Lincoln's Inn Fields and Localities Adjacent* (1896), pp. 150-6.

<sup>5</sup> J. E. Spingarn, *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* (1908), III.227.

<sup>6</sup> Dorothy Senior, *Life and Times of Colley Cibber* (1928), p. 38.

<sup>7</sup> D. Erskine Baker, *Biographica Dramatica*, Vol. I (1782), Intro., p. xxviii.

## THE LAUREATE OF EMPIRE

‘THAT BOTH my grandfathers had been Wesleyan ministers did not strike me until I was, familiarly, reminded of it.’ These words occur as a parenthesis in Rudyard Kipling’s autobiography. In their context they are, as far as one can see, apropos nothing in particular; the fact happens to come into his head as he writes and he notes it down, but does not seem to attach any importance to it. Other biographers have gone more fully into the matter. The most recent of them, Mr Hilton Brown, dwells upon it at some length, and he has interesting things to say about the way traces of Kipling’s Methodist ancestry may, once you are in possession of the clue, be detected in his work. But this is incidental; chiefly he is concerned to dispose of a rumour, at one time current in Anglo-Indian circles and even yet not entirely scotched, that there was, somewhere in his ancestry, a ‘touch of the tar brush’. But there are features of Kipling’s work which it is natural to connect with the circumstance that he came on both sides of a line of preachers, and of these I shall have something to say later.

Whatever we may make of them, the facts of Kipling’s ancestry are sufficiently interesting in themselves and must here be briefly noted. His father, John Lockwood Kipling—a man, as Mr Edward Shanks says, ‘of at least very great talent’—was the son of the Rev. Joseph Kipling, a Wesleyan minister of Yorkshire stock, who married Frances Lockwood, daughter of an architect who also was a Yorkshire Methodist. On his mother’s side he was a grandson of the Rev. George Macdonald and great-grandson of the Rev. James Macdonald, both Wesleyan ministers, and his uncle was the Rev. Frederic Macdonald, who became President of the Wesleyan Conference. A tablet in Wesley’s Chapel records the fact that the ministries of these three covered a period of a hundred and forty-four years. The Macdonalds were descendants of a Jacobite highlander who fled to Ireland after Culloden and afterwards settled in the Midlands. It would seem that there was also a Welsh strain in Kipling’s blood, for his grandfather, George Macdonald, married a certain Hannah Jones. Stanley Baldwin was Kipling’s cousin. He liked to pose as the typical bluff Englishman, but Lloyd George saw through him: ‘He is one of us,’ he said, ‘he has feelers all over him.’ Kipling himself said of his mother that she was ‘all Celt and three parts fire’. It was through her brother Frederic that she first met Lockwood Kipling, then a designer for a Burslem pottery; Frederic was stationed at the time in the Burslem Circuit. She was the eldest of five sisters, all gifted girls and four of them beautiful, and these four made remarkable marriages. One became the mother of Stanley Baldwin, another married Edward Poynter, afterwards President of the Royal Academy, and the fourth married Edward Burne-Jones, who was a schoolfellow of her brother Henry at King Edward’s School in Birmingham. It would seem therefore that the mutual aversion of art and evangelical religion is not invincible, after all!

But in the very assured young man who burst on the London literary scene in the early ‘nineties there was nothing whatever to suggest a haunter of elfland and the Celtic twilight. Already, at the age of twenty-four, he was writing in what was afterwards described as the ‘attention-damn-your-eyes’ style. Some rumour of him had already come out of India, where he had won for himself a mixed reputation as a journalistic *enfant terrible*. Lockwood Kipling had gone out to India at the time of his marriage to take up an appointment as Professor of Architectural

Sculpture in the University of Bombay, and it was there that Rudyard Kipling was born on 30th December, 1865. His boyhood was spent in England, and when he returned to India at the age of seventeen from the rather queer school which he has made familiar to us all in the pages of *Stalky and Co.*, he knew already what sort of life he was born for; in his own words, he was 'irretrievably committed to the ink-pot'. Without loss of time he plunged into journalism, first as 'assistant editor' (which in practice meant reporter and literary odd-job-man) on the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, and afterwards on the *Pioneer* at Allahabad. At the end of seven years he left India for good, but he had used his time so well that the foundations of his literary fortune were already made; all that was necessary now was to invest the spoils which his imagination had gathered on the London market.

In the opening sentence of his autobiography he says: 'Looking back from this my seventieth year, it seems to me that every card in my working life has been dealt me in such a manner that I had but to play it as it came'. This first hand—there were to be many others before the end of the rubber—had been dealt by India, but it was to London, where the stakes were high, that he came to play it. Almost as soon as he sat down a crowd began to gather at the table. His stay there was short, not more than eighteen months, but in that time he produced in quick succession the series of stories afterwards collected under the title *Life's Handicap*, two full-length novels, *The Light that Failed* and *The Naulahka*, and the body of verse which makes up the volume called *Barrack-room Ballads*. All this in eighteen months! Even allowing for the fact that some of the stories and verses had got into print before he left India it was a breath-taking performance; no wonder that people came to him exclaiming that there had been nothing like it since Dickens.

The keynote was struck in a line which is now almost a proverb—and, like many proverbs, is usually misquoted: 'And what should they know of England who only England know?' (He tells us that he was unable to get it right at first; it was his mother who showed him how, exactly, it needed to be said). Hardly anyone but himself seemed to be aware that the Queen of England was also Empress of India. J. R. Seeley had said that England acquired her empire in the eighteenth century in a fit of absent-mindedness; now, at the end of the nineteenth century, her thoughts were still on other things. There was for example a lot of chatter going on about Art, and the Puritan in Kipling was instinctively suspicious of it; it was not a healthy thing that self-avowed decadents like Aubrey Beardsley and Oscar Wilde were able to trail their languid airs and graces amid such general applause. The nice turn of an epigram, the ultimate refinement of a line-drawing, the drawing persiflage of the *Yellow Book* and the drawing-room comedy, were not the sort of things that ought to be occupying the mind of a race with an empire on its hands. But this was the intellectual atmosphere of the 'nineties, and Kipling could not stand it; a smell of corruption hung about it all:

*But I consort with long-haired things  
In velvet-collar rolls  
Who talk about the Aims of Art  
And 'theories' and 'goals'  
And moo, and coo with women-folk  
About their blessed souls.*

Luckily there was another literary faction in the field ready to give a welcome to a useful recruit. W. E. Henley was editing *The Scots Observer* and had gathered round him a group of young men who, in conscious opposition to the 'aesthetes', were writing in a tough-and-gruff style, and Kipling, as was to be expected, brought his pen into their camp. Henley had already come out as an apostle of Empire, and it was he who raised the idea of Imperialism in Kipling's mind to the level of a mystique and almost a religion. General ideas were not much in Kipling's line; he was a born story-teller who thought in pictures and was never much at home among abstractions. He had a passion for facts, all sorts of facts, and collected them as a boy fills his pockets with bits of string and other odds-and-ends on the chance that they would come in useful later on—and there were no holes in his memory. In much the same way he collected people. It was not that he was particularly fond of them; his family affections were exceptionally warm, but he was not gregarious; privacy was a need of his nature, and at all time he would go to great lengths to protect himself against the intrusion of strangers. His interest in people was professional. His newspaper training had taught him to keep his ears and eyes open; all sorts of people came into the office with bits of information, and the British community in India, civil and military, official and unofficial, pullulated with gossip. It may not be entirely fanciful to suggest further that the harsh glare of the Indian sunshine had done something to form his style. He revelled in violent colours and loved to lay them on thick—not with a trowel but, as Mr Shanks has said, with a spade. He was no philosopher, but he was a preacher, with a superb gift of rhetoric and a genius for illustration, and it was Henley who gave him something to preach about.

Like other preachers he won a hearing not so much by the purity of his doctrine as by the faith and fervour with which he proclaimed it. The doctrine itself was a puzzling compound of good and bad elements; the problem with Kipling indeed, and the reason for the strong feelings for and against he aroused in people, is the way he spun wool and shoddy together in his yarns. He was both prophet and jingo, 'a mixture', as someone has said, 'of Isaiah and Mr 'Enery 'Awkins'. What are we to make of the man who saw the Empire as 'the white man's burden', a trust and a call to serve, and yet was utterly scornful of all attempts to raise the 'lesser breeds without the Law' to the status of partners in the management of their own affairs? His incapacity for general ideas meant that he never thought anything out. He consistently set himself against 'each new piece of broadminded folly in India, Egypt, or Ceylon', and in effect his loud exhortations to the English people to be worthy of their Empire meant little more than that they must hold on to their position as the master race. Govern well by all means, but on no account must you relax your firm grip on the reins. It is a doctrine that bears an uncomfortable resemblance to the racial notions of Nazism, a poisoned cup compounded of idealism and arrogance.

But whatever we may think of this quasi-religion, there is no denying that he made it the basis of an ethic we cannot but respect. It is this, together with his virtuosity as versifier and story-teller, which keeps him alive when by all the rules he should have been buried with derision. The Imperial idea of which he made himself the mouthpiece is discredited; none of us dares any longer use the word, and in the slanging-matches which are the latest improvement on the old secret diplomacy, it takes rank as the most insulting of all the terms of international

abuse. Yet somehow Kipling survives the wreck of all that he stood for. It is not merely that he is read nostalgically by retired colonels and throw-outs from the former Indian Civil Service hankering after the good old days. I am constantly surprised to find his books on the shelves and in the hands of all sorts of people who, to my knowledge, have not even a sneaking sympathy with his ideas, and it is among the best judges that his reputation now stands highest. It took most people by surprise when, some years ago, Mr T. S. Eliot sponsored a selection of Kipling's verse. No one, it might have seemed, was less likely to be drawn to him than this most fastidious of critics, yet the estimate to which Mr Eliot came after a strict and expert scrutiny was unexpectedly high. It may well be that it is only now, when the old political passions have subsided, that it is possible to form a judgement that is not distorted by prejudice; and there can be little doubt that, in this calmer air and colder light, he shows to greater advantage than we had supposed.

I suspect, though in these days it is something of a paradox to say so, that one reason for his obstinate vitality is his constant moralizing. We are always being told that this is a bad habit; the moral of a story, if any, should be written in invisible ink, leaving the reader to use his own intelligence—if any—as a sort of reagent to bring it out. If this is indeed so, it is sad to reflect how many English writers there have been, from Shakespeare to Bernard Shaw, who never really understood their job! Kipling at any rate preached flagrantly and without shame—after all, the thing was in his blood; yet he kept his congregation to the end, and the indications are that he is beginning to draw a new one. He even observed some of the conventions of the pulpit; he liked to begin by giving out his text—usually a chapter-heading in verse—and his vocabulary is full of biblical turns of speech. As for his message, it is homespun but enduring, for it is concerned with the moral qualities that are indispensable in a workaday world. Tory as he was, and reactionary as he was supposed to be, there was no room for privilege in his scheme of things. The highest praise that he had for a King was: 'Our King asks nothing of any man more than our King himself has done'. He was no believer in equality; in civil affairs as in an army, there must be officers and degrees of authority, and there must be subordination and obedience to orders; but it is required of all ranks of men that they should do their duty. It may be that he had too little sympathy with the early ideals of the working-class movement. He would have had even less now that so much of the old idealism has evaporated and the evil leaven of materialism has crept in to take its place. In so far as organization has given the workers the upper hand they have not scrupled to use it for all it is worth to themselves. It is the old capitalist boot on the other foot, and if imitation is the sincerest form of flattery they cannot, in their hearts, have had such a bad opinion as they professed of the principles of the idle rich. Righteous indignation is often only a mask for envy.

He enforced his moral in all sorts of ways—as I have said, he was a preacher with a great gift for illustration. The poem entitled *M'Andrew's Hymn* may be taken as typical. (In passing, one may note that, like very many of his poems, it shows how strongly Kipling was influenced by Browning.) Old M'Andrew the marine engineer is standing the middle watch alone with God and his engines. He meditates through the night on many things, and chiefly, true Scotsman that he is, on metaphysics and machinery. God and the engines—yes, you can learn a lot about God by merely watching your engines. The truth, for one thing, of Calvin's doctrine. This mechanism—was it not all foreknown and predetermined?



And if the handiwork of man is the result of deliberate design and ordering, the inference is irresistible that the same is true of the handiwork of God. No engineer can doubt it. He, M'Andrew, thanks God that he is no Pelagian. What we are and where we are placed are all part of the divine purpose, decreed aforetime, not to be resisted; and in willing submission to it we find our fulfilment. 'Law, Order, Duty and Restraint, Obedience, Discipline'—this is the message of the machines, the grand theme which, in a mighty chorus and roar of sound, they hymn to the praise of God. And this is the message which, in a hundred different ways, Kipling consistently preaches to us all. It is possible to dislike his style of preaching—it is not always refined, and his voice is very loud—but no one can deny, in these days especially, that what he has to say is something that badly needs to be said.

M'Andrew, as we have seen, was a Calvinist. What Kipling's own theology was is not at all clear. The famous line about the cold Christ and tangled Trinities is no evidence; all that need be said of it is that it is a good imitation of Swinburne. He seems to use the word Allah in preference to God, and Mohammedan ways of thought appealed to him, but it would be a mistake to build too much on that. He did not go out to India as a missionary, and what he brought back from India was a wide tolerance—perhaps too wide a tolerance—for sincere beliefs of every kind.

*Wesley's following, Calvin's flock,  
White or yellow or bronze,  
Shaman, Ju-ju or Angekok,  
Minister, Mukamuk, Bonze—  
Here is a health, my brothers, to you,  
However your prayers are said,  
And praised be Allah who gave me two  
Separate sides to my head!*

This is all very well, but for a man who liked to get things clear in his mind it is a bit indefinite. He certainly knew his Bible—the Old Testament, perhaps, better than the New; and it would seem that it was by the Old Testament that his working beliefs were chiefly formed. Chief among them was the concept of the Law. The splendid tradition of service he had encountered in India had captured his imagination entirely. In his eyes it was the supreme virtue, and in the old Hebrew ideal of fidelity to the Law he found a confirmation of it to which his essentially religious nature responded eagerly. That the Hebrews were a warlike people, ready at all times to defend the Law with their lives, was a further recommendation. To live by Law and to be ready, if need be, to die fighting on its behalf, was the whole duty of man. A common charge that is brought against him is that he was an advocate of militarism. That he admired the armed forces and was full of praise for the military virtues is true enough, but it is not in the least true that he glorified brute force. He defended the South African War because he believed, rightly or wrongly, that the Boers were barring the way against the spread of enlightened government; but he hated the barbarous arrogance of Prussianism, which threatened to crush the rule of law under the jackboot. He neither glorified war nor condemned it, but he saw the British Army as an indispensable instrument of government in an imperfect world, and his respect for it was only one facet of his reverence for devotion in any walk of life to exacting standards of conduct.

Before I leave this subject there is one thing more that calls for comment. It will be noticed that I spell 'Law' with a capital L; that of course was Kipling's own practice. His imaginative way of thinking combined with his religious sense to raise the conception of Law to the level of a cosmic idea. To this extent at least he must be ranked among the mystics. Turn where you will you encounter Law, for Law is of the nature of things. The inanimate world obeys blindly, because it must; but with the dawning of consciousness there are the beginnings, however dim, of recognition, faint stirrings of a sense of responsibility, and awful dreams of rebellion. Even the jungle is not without its code, and the beasts of the jungle have their glimmerings of good and evil. All Kipling's fairy-tales are didactic—there is a powder mixed into the jam; in this respect he stands in the tradition of a long line of fabulists.

Kipling, then, was first and foremost a moralist, a man with a message. When the poem *Recessional* appeared in *The Times* on the morrow of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee he sent a copy of it to his uncle Frederic, with a note to the effect that Methodist blood would out. I have suggested that, whatever the critics may say, this didacticism has had a good deal to do with his continued survival, in spite of the fact that much else that he stood for seems now not only outdated but discredited. Whatever the morals of the English may be, they are inveterate moralizers! But of course he has much more than that to recommend him. After all, people do not swallow the treacle for the sake of the brimstone—it is the other way round; and the great thing is that Kipling's treacle is first-rate golden syrup. The simile, I may claim, is apt; he has himself said that 'there is no line of my verse or prose which has not been mouthed till the tongue has made all smooth, and memory, after many recitals, has mechanically skipped the grosser superfluities'. Always he was the painstaking and conscientious craftsman, and the words I have quoted afford a valuable clue to his style. For the full appreciation of it we too must flavour its syllables on our palate, weigh its cadences delicately with the inward ear. We should not allow ourselves to be put off by the surface brazenness of his manner; underlying it, if we listen carefully, there is always music.

The discussion started by T. S. Eliot as to whether Kipling was a poet or only a writer of verse—and in any case what, exactly, the difference between verse and poetry is—need not now detain us. Tennyson praised him, and it was only a bad joke of Lord Salisbury's which prevented him from succeeding Tennyson as Poet Laureate. For myself I confess that, in whatever class his work comes, I long had a distaste for it which I could not overcome. Since then I have learned to appreciate its amazing technical merits, yet for all that something of the old dislike persists. I do not think this is due to prejudice; there is good reason for it. His old editor on the *Civil and Military Gazette* sometimes found it necessary to take him down a peg or two—'clever, a'int ye?'—and that I fancy is the trouble. He was clever, he was a genius, and no one will blame him because he knew it; but—he knew it a bit too well. Kipling never quite loses himself in his work; he is never himself so absorbed that the reader ceases to be aware of him. It is all signed work, and signed with a bit of a flourish. He had his share of vanity, but that is a pardonable weakness from which not many artists are exempt, and it was not simply vanity that caused him to intrude himself on his readers' attention. The truth seems to be that he was rather *too* gifted. It gave him extraordinary pleasure to use his gifts; he was always trying to bring off new tricks and he nearly always succeeded; and he liked

to feel that there was a mystified and enchanted audience gasping at his astonishing sleight of hand. This is not to say that he was insincere; he had a message and he believed what he preached, but, always, and at all costs, he was determined to be a *popular* preacher. It may be that there was a touch of the Methodist heredity in that also; but it is not to everyone's taste.

W. S. HANDLEY JONES

## COLLECTED POEMS BY DYLAN THOMAS

THE recent publication of the Collected Poems of Dylan Thomas again brings to our notice the most discussed poet of recent years. His published work is quite small: in 1934 *Eighteen Poems*, in 1936 *Twenty-five Poems*, in 1939 *The Map of Love*, and in 1946 *Deaths and Entrances*. Those poems which Dylan Thomas wishes to preserve, and one or two new poems are included in the new collection.

In the thirties those who read poetry were becoming accustomed to 'difficult' poetry, and were able to appreciate the works of Eliot and Auden and Spender, but Thomas led the way with new difficulties. Most of the methods used to understand or appreciate older poets failed with the newcomer. Intelligent criticism varied from 'the most absolute poetry of our time', to 'an uncondemned tour of Bedlam'. Even Louis McNiece stated: 'He is like a drunk man speaking wildly, pouring out a series of nonsense images.' Many others felt that the limit of unintelligibility had been reached, and that the poems were either ravings or deliberate fakes and shams.

The few relevant facts about Thomas are that he was born in 1914 at Swansea, went to the Grammar School there, became a journalist and reviewer, was found unfit for military service in 1939, and then did excellent work with the BBC and in films. He himself said: 'I only ask that my poetry should be taken literally.' It is my intention to examine some of his poetry, and give more particular attention to the recent developments, especially to the religious aspect lately shown. Like anyone else who writes about Thomas today I am indebted for many ideas to the only full-length study of him that I know—Henry Treece's *Dylan Thomas*, published in 1949. I am indebted also to the comments of Mr David Martin.

Before directly considering this poetry it may be useful to consider what any poet is trying to do when he composes poetry. He is using the medium of words to express certain matters and to enable his reader to bring to light or recreate these thoughts or moods or feelings. This he might do in prose, but in poetry he is especially using the extralogical aspects of language to secure his effects. He may employ different metres and stresses, so that rhythm is added to the ordinary meaning of the sentences he has written. This rhythm will in different degrees be re-established in the readers. He may make skilful use of sound, and use various systems of rhyme, half-rhyme, assonance, and alliteration. He will certainly employ imagery of various kinds, so that the reader imaginatively sees, hears, feels, tastes, or smells, as he reads what has been written. He will also sometimes arrange his verse so that the reader is affected by the general lay-out of the words—by the architecture of the poem. Thus, in some sense the poet is calling in the services

of the other arts: architecture, music, movement, the colour and outline of drawing and painting. Different poets stress different techniques, and call for differing degrees of imagination or memory in their readers. But all place themselves in his charge when they publish their poems; for their work will mean different things to different people. In a sense each reader sees in the poem what he wishes—or has the taste and ingenuity—to see.

Most of those statements are true of all poetry, but in recent years other factors have become even more important. Freud and other psychologists have stressed that our conscious minds are only a small portion of our true selves. Deep below consciousness are the vast caverns containing our primitive instincts and passions, perhaps even linking up with the 'caverns' of other people, with the race, or with the eternal spirit. Of most of our unconscious we must for ever be unaware, but traces of it pass into consciousness in our dreams, day-dreams, in apparent irrational behaviour, in slips of speech, and in imagery we employ as symbols of deeper meaning.

Herbert Read writing of Surrealism said: 'A human being drifts through life like an iceberg, only partly floating above the level of consciousness. It is the aim of the Surrealist, whether as a painter or as a poet, to try to realize some of the dimensions and characteristics of his submerged being, and to do this he resorts to the significant imagery of dreams and dream-like states of mind.'

Freud and his followers also stressed the enormous dynamic importance of sex in all our lives, both of sex as it is commonly understood and of sex as the great creative power in all creation. Sex, they argued, is most frequently expressed by symbols in our dreams and thinking. Thus, many recent poets have tried to express the unconscious rather than the logical conscious parts of our minds. They have also used symbols as commonly employed in dreams. These methods have led, in the words of David Gascoigne, to 'a perpetual flow of irrational thought in the form of images'.

Some of the methods employed by Surrealist writers ought to be appreciated by religious people who know apocalyptic literature. If we read the Book of the Revelation or Daniel we find a jumble of imagery which cannot be fitted neatly into straight narrative or conventional pictures. The beasts, seals, elders, candlesticks, thrones, lambs, and white horses, express truths not to be shown by photographs of everyday life. So the Surrealist painter and poet attempts to do the same thing. The method has many dangers: it may drift into lunacy or nonsense, and it will be difficult for the reader to decide if it has done so; and its results may be too quickly misjudged by those with too-conventional minds. But at its best it may stir emotions and desires untouched by older methods, and express truths which cannot be stated in clear prose.

Dylan Thomas certainly employs the surrealist technique, and he has sometimes been acclaimed as the leader of the Apocalyptic school of modern poetry. The earlier poems show almost an obsession about the beginning of life, conception, the pre-natal period, birth. There is hardly a poem that has not some references to it, and to the sea which becomes a symbol for the surge of life. All the future life is seen in the first joining of single cells, so that conception is in a sense the moment when death begins. But mixed with the idea of our personal beginnings is that of the original Creation with the spirit moving on the face of the waters and darkness being turned to light.

*In the beginning was the pale signature,  
Three-syllabled and starry as the smile;  
And after came the imprints on the water,  
Stamp of the minted face upon the moon;  
The blood that touched the crosstree and the grail  
Touched the first cloud and left a sign.*

*'In the Beginning'*

Darkness must become light. Dark thoughts, desires, motives, and ideas, must be forced from the Unconscious into the Conscious. Then, and then only can the hidden Fear which haunts man be transmuted into Hope. This doctrine preached by Dylan Thomas has much in common with the Freudian ideas expressed in psycho-analysis. 'Whatever is hidden should be made naked. To be stripped of darkness is to be clean.' It is 'the struggle from darkness toward some measure of light'.

In the early poems there is little direct religious influence; in fact some critics found the stress to be on man only. For example, in the poem 'If I were tickled by the rub of love' he considers the subjects he ought to write about, Death, or Love, or Religion. What must touch him most nearly, or with the lightest breath affect his senses and mind?

*And what's the rub? Death's feather on the nerve?  
Your mouth, my love, the thistle in the kiss?  
My Jack of Christ born thorny on the tree?  
The words of death are dryer than his stiff,  
My wordy wounds are printed with your hair.  
I would be tickled by the rub that is:  
Man be my metaphor.*

It would be foolish, in my opinion, to pretend that he has abandoned love, death, and religion. Surely Man about whom he writes is always to be considered in relation to those great topics. Often the Welsh upbringing can be sensed through the words—the Wales of Chapels with the words pouring out in fervour and the preachers with their 'hwyll'.

Throughout the poems there are constant biblical references and proper names. (It is difficult for him to keep Adam and Eve out.) In fact the sea, birth, and biblical stories are the source of most of his imagery.

Dylan Thomas's use of imagery is best understood from his own explanation: A poem by myself needs a host of images. I 'make' one image, though 'make' is not the word: I let, perhaps, an image be made emotionally in me and then apply to it what intellectual and critical forces I possess; let it breed another; let that image contradict the first; make, of the third image, bred out of the other two together, a fourth contradictory image, and let them all, within my imposed formal limits, conflict.

Having said so much about the general background, interests, and use of imagery of Thomas, we can turn to the *Collected Poems* and see what development has taken place and what views have more recently developed. A prose note, dated November 1952, explains his own reason for writing poetry at all.

I read somewhere of a shepherd who, when asked why he made, from within fairy rings, ritual observances to the moon to protect his flocks, replied: 'I'd be a damn fool if I didn't!' These poems, with all their crudities, doubts, and confusions, are written for the love of Man and in praise of God, and I'd be a damn fool if they weren't.



And in the verse 'Prologue' he says:

*At poor peace I sing  
To you strangers. . . .  
My ark sings in the sun  
At God speeded summer's end  
And the flood flowers now.*

The poems as a whole, however, are certainly not in the sun at the beginning of *Collected Poems*. The flood is dark, and fear almost overwhelms hope. The unborn children cry in the womb, and discern only their own deaths. Sighs and grief and agony are all that come from man's twisted brain, 'groping for matter under the dog's plate'.

*Man should be cured of distemper.  
For all there is to give I offer:  
Crumbs, barn, and halter.*

This is surely pessimistic enough, and to the grief of the world he apparently 'knows no answer'. However, as the pages are turned there are increasing signs of hope. It is as if old phrases, and rhetoric from Chapels amongst Welsh hills seep back into his mind. From the darkness he cries:

*And death shall have no dominion. . . .  
Though they go mad they shall be sane,  
Though they sink through the sea they shall rise again;  
Though lovers be lost love shall not;  
And death shall have no dominion.*

It is the speech rhythm of the Old Testament prophets, and echoes the assurance of the Book of Revelation. A set of ten very difficult sonnets follows. This is full of a groping toward a faith, as perhaps its title indicates: 'Altarwise by owl-light.' Adam, Ishmael, Jacob, Eve, Pharaoh, Jonah, Mary, and Christ, become mixed with metaphors about Capricorn and Cancer, Rip Van Winkle, the windy West and two-gunned Gabriel, Virgil, and the Lord's Prayer on a grain of rice. It is the 'tale's sailor from a Christian voyage', and ends with 'My nest of mercies in the rude, red tree'.

The last third of the book mostly consists of poems already published in *Deaths and Entrances*. Again, the title may be significant; for 'Entrances' comes after 'Death'. Many of these seem to have been written during the great incendiary air-raids. The fires seem to have burned up the plague, and the surrounding tragedies of the street strangely confirm the poet in Hope. His interests become wider and poems now refer to friends and his little son, not merely to himself and to abstractions. In 'Poem in October'—a month he seems particularly to like—he celebrates 'my thirtieth year to heaven'. The poem is full of joy, and abounds in most pleasant references to nature:

*A springful of larks in a rolling  
Cloud and the roadside bushes brimming with whistling  
Blackbirds and the sun of October  
Summery  
On the hill's shoulder.*

I would thoroughly agree with Mr G. W. Stonier in the *New Statesman* that this poem must be placed among the outstanding poems of our time. No poet has remembered childhood with more tenderness.

*Forgotten mornings when he walked with his mother  
Through the parables  
Of sun light  
And the legends of the green chapels.*

From memory and from the beauty around him he has found at last his 'heart's truth'.

'A Winter's Tale' is based on the story of the Nativity, and increasingly the poems are deeply religious in tone, hinting at the 'rough love that breaks all rocks'.

*There was a Saviour  
Rarer than radium,  
Commoner than water, crueller than truth. . . .*

In humility man appears to find a new responsibility toward others, and in penitence, peace. The new Dylan Thomas is seen clearest in the curious poem 'Vision and Prayer'. Like some of the seventeenth-century metaphysical poets he here experiments with curiously shaped verse; first with a pyramid shape the second half of which is inverted; and then with an egg-timer shape. The final verse reads as follows:

*I turn the corner of prayer and burn  
In a blessing of the sudden  
Sun. In the name of the damned  
I would turn back and run  
To the hidden land  
But the loud sun  
Christens down  
The sky.  
I  
Am found.  
O let him  
Scald me and drown  
Me in his world's wound.  
His lightning answers my  
Cry. My voice burns in his hand.  
Now I am lost in the blinding  
One. The sun roars at the prayer's end.*

So with the sun's roars as faith is established Dylan Thomas appears to face the future. It will be interesting to see where he journeys from here 'for the love of Man and in praise of God'. Certainly an examination of *Collected Poems* shows his odyssey from the gloom of pre-natal night to a land of promise, of gold, of fire.

*Glory, glory, glory  
The sundering ultimate kingdom of genesis' thunder.*

T. B. SHEPHERD

## THE TEACHING OF PSEUDO-PHOCYLIDEA

THE *Pseudo-Phocylidea* provides the student of Diaspora Judaism in the Inter-Testamental period with an interesting example of the characteristic literature of contemporary Jewish apologetic. Its purpose is obviously to commend the central doctrines of Judaism to Greek readers but, although at a later date the Alexandrian Philo sought to bring together for the scholarly the higher Greek and Jewish philosophies and to reconcile the teaching of Jewish Scripture with especially the Greek doctrines of Platonism, it is probable that the attempt here is to achieve a similar purpose not so much for the intellectuals as for the man-in-the-street whose knowledge was conveyed and expressed through the aphorisms of gnomic teaching. The teaching of the 'Pseudo-Phocylidea' covers a considerable range of subjects and ideas which stem from widely different sources and it is evident that the writer found difficulty in subduing his medium. Separate and sometimes irreconcilable Greek and Jewish elements can be distinguished. Although the various maxims may not necessarily convey the writer's own thought, their very selection and grouping together probably indicate his point of view. On this basis certain generalizations may legitimately be made. The varying elements in the poem become more easily distinguishable as its teaching is considered under various headings:

### DOCTRINE OF GOD

In general the background of the poem is monotheistic. Although the conviction is more assumed than actually expressed, God is believed to be the transcendent Creator and Ruler of the Universe which in turn is seen to be ordered, harmonious, and coherent (72). There is only one God and before everything and everyone else He is to be revered (8). He alone is all-wise and powerful and in Him alone is true blessedness (54). With God are the issues of life and death and all souls, whether high or low, come under His dominion (111). Each creature receives many blessings, among them a means of self-defence, and this reflects the providential care of God (125). A glimpse of His immanence is caught in the belief that man is made in the Divine image (106). In all His dealings with men God proves Himself righteous and from this conception of His nature springs all true morality (11). God is concerned with all human judgements and will not tolerate injustice. With a typically Jewish 'anthropopathism' the writer conceives of God 'hating' forswearing and the perjured man (17). As the source of life and prosperity, God demands that men share their wealth with those in need (29).

Other passages of the *Pseudo-Phocylidea* refer to life's swift and unpredictable changes. Life is a wheel and happiness unstable (27). Excess of any kind is dangerous since it may lead to an insolence which tempts fate. Often the over-confident are suddenly abased and the afflicted delivered (119). In this context these statements possibly carry the underlying thought that the ways of God are inscrutable. Isolated from it they may be interpreted to suggest that life is at the mercy of blind chance and in the power of an impersonal Fate, a very different conception from that of orthodox Judaism.

The poem further contains a polytheistic reference impossible to reconcile with the conceptions of Jewish orthodoxy. Line 104 declares that the departed become gods, while lines 162-3 speak of the 'Blest' who along with mortals are subject to

toil and whose excellence is developed through it. It is evident that there is no clearly thought out and coherent doctrine of God but an intermingling of two different outlooks and conceptions. Little of the nature of God is understood beyond the fact that He is all-powerful, wise, and righteous.

#### DOCTRINE OF MAN

The teaching on man finds its basis in the Old Testament affirmation that he was created in the image of God (106). The body is of the dust of the earth and at death returns to it. At this point the poem gives expression to a belief in immortality declaring that the soul is by nature immortal and is unharmed by death (115). As to what happens at death three theories are given. The first is expressed as a hope that there is a bodily resurrection for the departed and it is for this reason that the remains of the dead are to be treated with respect. In the second view the spirit proceeds to the eternal halls of Hades where all, rich and poor alike, are made equal. Even in the abode of the dead, God reigns over all souls. In the third view the body is turned to dust and the spirit is released into the upper elements. The first two views are found in Jewish belief while the third is characteristically Greek. No attempt is made in the poem to harmonize these points of view nor is any description given of the nature of life after death.

The poem assumes that human nature is unstable and biased toward evil. Except by implication, the writer does not delineate the character of the good life so intent is he upon warning his readers against the evil life. Again the writer is more concerned with the consideration of specific evils than with any abstract conception of evil. He condemns adultery, dishonesty in business, theft, the inhospitable spirit, strife and murderous intent, the lust for wealth, hypocrisy and deception, boastfulness, brooding over past sorrows, self-indulgence, envy, oppression of the poor, evil associations, rumour-mongering, delving into magic, idleness, cruelty to children and to slaves, disrespect to old age. The approach to the question of morality is in the main external. In line 11 however the important assertion is made that all human judgements and thus all human actions come before the judgement of God. Behind all these precepts is the confident assumption that, if he so desires, man's will is strong enough for him to reject the evil and cleave to the good. There is no teaching upon the need for forgiveness nor for Divine aid in conquering evil.

#### THE MORAL IDEAL

As Dr Maldwyn Hughes points out in *The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature* (The Epworth Press), p.26, for the Jew, 'the Moral Ideal was embodied in the Law, which was the expression of the Divine will'. The authority with which many of the judgements in the poem are made upon human life and action clearly resides in the Jewish Law from which so much of the teaching has been derived. There are other maxims which do not stem from the strictly Jewish emphasis on the Law but which can be found e.g., in Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, etc. Though some eminent students think it needless to go outside Israel for 'the source of the Wisdom conception', the literary affiliations of the poem make it clear that here may be found the influence of Greek thought. Here the Moral Ideal is identified with Wisdom. Wisdom is divine, determines ordered and acceptable living, provides the power of true discrimination (88), and is given expression in the good life (90). Wisdom is man's greatest defence. Wisdom is temperate and chooses the

mean even in religion (98). Wisdom abhors the unrestrained and uncontrolled and regards due measure as best in all things. In this is reflected one of the ideals of Greek thought.

In the *Pseudo-Phocylidea* the pursuit or rejection of these ideals is linked with a conception of rewards and punishments. Hard work develops virtue and excellence, but idleness hunger. Association with evil men leads to self-destruction (134). To receive stolen goods is to become a thief. In some instances it is God who judges the injustice of men while in others it is Fate, angered by human insolence, which brings retribution.

#### SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

By his selection of material the writer reveals a keen sense of the value and obligation of home and family relationships. Next to God Himself parents are to be honoured. Ties of kinship are to be respected, with special regard for venerable old age (219). Children are to be given kindly but not over-indulgent treatment. A mother's authority over her son is to be upheld. Husband and wife are urged to live in love and harmony together until old age. Marriage is favoured since children are a repayment of a debt to nature. Great care must be exercised in the right choice of a wife. Evil associations are destructive of the family relationship. Second marriages are not commended since often they lead to vexation.

Friendship with others outside the family group is to be desired when such friends prove worthy. Self-seeking flatterers are a menace to be avoided. The kindness of friends is to be repaid generously.

All men are deserving of fair treatment, especially the poor, the homeless, and the stranger. Hypocrisy and deceit are to be avoided. Confidences must not be betrayed, a neighbour's property and boundaries are to be respected. Even to one's personal enemy kindly help is to be given when opportunity offers. By this means the enemy may become a friend. The writer, however, sets a limit upon such generous action by observing that it is useless endeavouring to assist an evil man. Slaves, too, must be given fair and considerate treatment while thoughtful consideration should be extended even to birds and animals (84, 140).

#### SOCIAL QUESTIONS

The poem deals with such social conditions as may have existed in the locality where it was produced. Excessive wealth and luxury are condemned. The lust for possessions is a disruptive force even within the family circle (42). On the other hand the poor who are often afflicted should be given kindly and generous assistance (19).

Stress is laid upon the value of law and order. All major differences should be settled through the processes of Law where there must be true justice for rich and poor alike. Mob violence is to be abhorred while civil dissension and strife are inexcusable especially in time of war. In all social questions the poem advocates fairness and equality for all. Each man must be given his due (137).

#### CONCLUSION

A survey of the teaching of *Pseudo-Phocylidea* provides a fair picture of what must have been an advanced type of Jewish thinking within the Greek environment probably at Alexandria about the beginning of the second century B.C. Belief in



immortality is gradually taking hold of Jewish consciousness and the horizon of faith now stretches beyond death to a future life. There are still deficiencies in teaching. No investigation is made into the problems of suffering or of the purpose of human life. There is little understanding of the nature of God or of human sin. There is no perception of a need for forgiveness or redemption. The teaching is generally external and utilitarian and far more concerned with individual than with social life. Little interest is displayed in the wider affairs of the nation. Again there are no passages of noble or impassioned writing, most of the precepts dealing with commonplace needs and situations. It is, in the commonplace however, that the greater part of life is lived and these maxims do touch on feelings, desires, and situations that belong to the experience of every day.

Inconsistencies in thought were inevitable when the writer sought to harmonize irreconcilable ideas, but he did achieve his purpose in conveying to Greek readers, through a well-chosen Greek medium, a concise summary of some elements of Jewish teaching. This was perhaps all he desired to achieve and it is to his credit that he gave expression to so much within so confined a space.

As a piece of practical teaching on moral issues as they arise in everyday life, the *Pseudo-Phocylidea* is full of sound counsel and, in view of the fact that it was written probably two centuries before the Christian era, it reaches a high standard. The poem is also of interest in that an examination of its literary affiliations and relationships reveals the fact that it was used in turn by some of the compilers of the *Sibylline Oracles*, by the writer of *Pseudo-Aristeas* in the Table-Talk section, and by Philo, providing for the poem a *terminus ad quem*. A comparison of the Greek sections of the poem with the teaching of the *Theognidea* further indicates a strong possibility that both are dependent upon a common source which, in the absence of other sources, may well have been the actual teachings of the Milesian poet Phocylides. This adds support to the suggestion made in 1924 by Dr H. Ranston that the *Pseudo-Phocylidea* might contain genuine material *Ecclesiastes* and the *Early Greek Wisdom Literature* (The Epworth Press), p.83. It is not improbable that this Greek-speaking Alexandrian Jew somewhere between 250—160 B.C. selected probably from an oral tradition some of the teaching of Phocylides to which he added the precepts of the Jewish Law, sending the composite work out to the Greek public under the authority of the name of the Milesian sage. The composite nature of the poem should not then prevent the recognition of its intrinsic value, preserving as this work may well do some of the authentic teaching of Phocylides and reflecting the contemporary life and society of Alexandria.

JOHN J. LEWIS

[Text of Ps.-Phoc. "*Anthologia Lyrica*", E. Diehl, Teubner, pp. 194-208.]

---

# Notes and Discussions

## THE CRUX

### A Study in the Art of Wisdom

THE search for wisdom brings a man with monotonous regularity to a certain crux, a *pons asinorum* of the inner life.

All men desire wisdom and, in one sense, no man chooses folly. Wisdom is the means to satisfaction and fulfilment, and men play the fool because, in the moment of folly, they believe that by it they will be satisfied and fulfilled. The distinction between wisdom and folly is not in the aim, but in the result; for wisdom proves to be efficient whereas folly turns out to be a delusion and a fraud.

Wisdom is distorted so as to become folly because men, though they desire to be wise, have a deep-rooted resistance to being brought to face the crux of wisdom. Most men evade it by an instinctive reaction that steers them from the encounter before they are even conscious that the crux exists. These are the 'healthy-minded' of whom William James spoke; they are often brilliantly successful in the management of their lives, but their success is achieved by the courtesy of life, and life is apt to fail in courtesy. The healthy-minded to whom life is discourteous either learn wisdom or are transmuted into urbane cynics, neurotic complainers or bitter rebels—according to temperament. The plus sign is turned, by some spiritual algebraical law, into a minus; the positive becomes a negative. Only wisdom can preserve the healthy-minded from ship-wreck when the storms blow up.

Those who have suffered this ship-wreck, together with those who became out-at-elbows with life at such an early age as never to have manifested the healthy-minded temperament, stand in need of wisdom also; but the natural resistance to facing the crux is intensified and they are likely to pass through it only in the violence of a psychic re-birth—to become the 'twice-born' of James's classification. Moreover, the danger of spiritual abortion is high.

It is in the experience of the troubled and distressed soul that the nature of the crux is dramatically revealed, and it is with such that we shall concern ourselves; for what we learn in this morbid field will apply, though in a less striking manner, to all men, however unproblematic they may be.

The healthy-minded never know that there is any crux at all, unless the discourtesies of life have thrust it before them, and they then pass through it without knowing they have done so. The less fortunate envy them, but can learn nothing from them apart from peripheral truths of a temporarily uplifting nature. The troubled and distressed cannot escape from their predicament without being brought to the crux, but there are certain fundamental errors into which they are apt to fall. Some solve their problem by conscious or unconscious manipulation. The criminal is the classic example; he goes in for wickedness because he believes that it will bring him the satisfaction and fulfilment that all men seek, and, by incurring the risk of social disapproval and punishment, he absolves himself from the payment of the fair price that wisdom exacts of her customers. He rarely suffers from a bad conscience. The neurotic treads the same road, but is debarred by his conscience from choosing the frankly predatory and violent way of the criminal; he, too, is 'on the make', however, and wishes to gain satisfaction and

fulfilment without payment of the dues demanded by wisdom. He rejects the discipline that is the fair price of the precious thing that he, in common with all other men, desires. The neurotic, unlike the criminal, is haunted by the sense that there is a crux that he has missed, and he is pathetically anxious to find it; but the resistance against finding it is strong and he is put to the necessity of endless evasions that contrast sharply with the clear-cut substitution of folly for wisdom that characterizes his brother, the criminal.

One evasion is the manufacture of a private *pons asinorum*—which is then triumphantly crossed. In point of fact, there is little need to manufacture one, for numbers of them exist in the form of pseudo-religious disciplines that offer an exciting sense of release and that promise to carry the sufferer into a realm where he can go on his triumphant and superior way. With some, the secret is esoteric and must be preserved within the circle, whereas with others it is to be thrust upon the neighbours; having been 'saved', others must be saved by his persuasion.

The false crux is closely related to the true one; it is characterized by taking an aspect of the truth and presenting it as the whole truth, and in this lies the secret of its strange dynamic. Truth, even when distorted, is potent and can work miracles.

There are, broadly speaking, two forms of false crux. The first can be called 'activism' and the second 'passivity'. Sometimes they alternate, but the alternation of two aspects of truth is no substitute for the whole truth. In the West the activist mode predominates, and we can recognize it in, for example, the muscular, Roman-Stoic, style of Christianity. It is founded upon the Henleyesque assumption that we are 'the captains of our souls and the masters of our fate'. Life is to be laid hold upon with courage and clear vision, and, supported by a virile morality and endeavour, we shall win through. The politician is particularly attracted to this attitude, and is apt to dream of brave new worlds waiting to be built upon the vision of truth vouchsafed to him and to the Party. In the East, the passivist technique prevails. It is for us to submit, to yield, to be moulded, and thus to draw from life the salvation that eludes activity. Activity, indeed, is the focal point of tragedy, of pain and disillusion. It is life that must do the manipulation; it is for us to fall in with it and facilitate its purposes. This passivity is to be found in the West—as activity is to be found in the East—but the emphasis is unmistakable. Western passivity is to be observed in many manifestations of pseudo-christianity which produce an other-worldly, precious style of faith that contracts out of the struggle and evades the agony—an excess which is not to be seen so often in the East, where passivity is indigenous.

As against these false solutions the true one is intangible, so that to touch it is to destroy it. It is so simple that the activists and passivists of East and West fail to find it, and whenever men believe they have captured it in words they have passed, without noticing, over the verge of truth into the ditch of error. Movements that have their inception in the authentic way of wisdom are apt, by expressing that inspiration, to initiate their own disintegration.

This central way of wisdom is to be found, almost obliterated by the rubble and debris of religion, at the heart of Christianity; but it is found also in every system of faith, and even in those faiths that deny their own religious character. It is found notably in the doctrine of Tao, and it lies unnoticed in the techniques of auto-suggestion, suggestion, and psycho-analysis. The best word to describe it is faith; another, which has been much in vogue of late, is acceptance. Both words can

mislead the unwary, and the controversies over 'faith' and 'works' provide a classic example of the debate between the two errors that flank the *pons asinorum*.

One of the most helpful terms was suggested by the French Psychologist, Baudouin, who did so much to rationalize the work of Coué. Baudouin described the effective attitude as *contention*. As in English, the word means strife, but when we look at it again (in either language) we notice that it might equally have meant, a state of contentment. If, by an imaginative effort, we marry these senses into one total meaning, we fall upon the sense in which Baudouin used it. *Contention* was an effortless intensity, a peculiar mode of *attention*. It is, indeed, an attention that has, as yet, nothing to which it can attend. *Contention* waits actively, springing to attention when the object is presented.

Baudouin's *contention* is precisely what Simone Weil means when she speaks of waiting on God—*Attente de Dieu*; for God is not an object and this *attente* is the central, primary attitude after which Baudouin was groping. Simone Weil described this same attitude as *hypomene*, a Greek word of which the Latin equivalent is *patientia*, and the English, patience. Perhaps her best indication of the sense in which she used *hypomene* is found in her essay upon education, in which she speaks of concentration. If students are told to concentrate they often respond by a tensing of the muscles, as though by knitting their brows and contorting their bodies they can master the matter in hand. But mastery is a two-way, reciprocal operation. We do not master history except in so far as history masters us. We absorb history only because we are absorbed by history.

The way of wisdom, in study, lies along the road that is flanked by the ditches of activism and passivity. To learn, we must be contentious and take the citadel of knowledge by force; we must equally submit, and allow ourselves to be taken by storm. *Contention* is the secret of learning; to learn is to 'wait on' French irregular verbs and upon the solution of quadratic equations.

This truth is universal, and a banal illustration will underline its universality. The flair of the skilled batsman lies in the core of *contention* that informs his every movement. He succeeds because he does not try; he waits upon the situation, but the situation finds him attentive with every nerve and muscle waiting upon the moment of attack.

Patience is a poor substitute for this 'waiting on . . .', but there is one sense in which the word is surprisingly apt. To be a *patient* is to learn exactly this attitude. The patient is more than a sick man; he is within a relationship that makes him a patient. The patient cannot win back his own health, nor can the doctor give it back to him; health comes through a saving relationship of faith and faithfulness subsisting between him and life—of which the doctor is, for the moment, the focal point. By his skill and wisdom he can facilitate the reciprocal traffic between his patient and the *vis medicatrix* that can restore health and strength. The patient is neither active nor passive in the matter, but actively waits upon health in ready obedience.

Wisdom is found in being a good patient to life, in waiting upon God. It is maintained by resisting the temptation to slip into either masterly activity or beggarly inactivity. The price of wisdom is a total surrender to wisdom, an absorption and an obedience that leave no place of privacy into which we can withdraw from God. This has been said a thousand times in a thousand different ways; it is enough to *hear* it once.

SETON POLLOCK

## 'TIME' AND THE DIVINE ARTIST

TWO simple incidents in bygone days set me meditating on the mystery of *Time*. On my first visit to Canton I was taken to see a wonderful old Chinese clepsydra, or water-clock, on the old wall near the North gate. It was very ancient and very simple; if I remember rightly, just two huge bronze vessels and an arrangement controlling the steady drip of water from the upper to the lower; the whole thing being connected up with another kind of clock at the side. Here, then, was one simple way of measuring time. It would be very interesting to report that Smith minor in his school sports did the mile in the excellent time of a pint and a quarter!

Not long afterwards I had a strange experience that set me thinking about the difference between time as ordinary duration and the mystery of real time, time as the philosopher might think of it. I was hurrying along a narrow raised path through the paddy fields and came to a part where the water had burst through, leaving a wide gap. Taking a short run back I made a long jump and cleared it safely but as I landed on the far side, my feet slipped just a trifle on the wet path and I felt myself pirouetting and wobbling, trying desperately to keep my balance. The strange thing was that during those few moments before I finally slumped full length in the mud, time seemed to expand, something like a concertina. Said I to myself: 'I'm all right, yes, no, perhaps; surely . . . I'm not going to tumble. . . . I'm for it, yes, after all . . . going, going, gone!'

Those two experiences, trifling as they were, led me to think rather carefully about time and the real meaning of that ambiguous word. Clearly there is a difference between the ordinary notion of time as a series of uniform duration and measurement; and on the other hand real time in itself. But *is it real?* It certainly feels real enough; or is it mainly subjective? In other words, which is more correct, to say that I am in time and space, or that time and space are in me? Kant said that time and space are merely 'subjective forms of intuition', means by which we apprehend reality, tools if you like, to enable us to build up our so-called real world? The scientific thinker of today is giving up all the old notions of a solid objective universe with our conventional standards of measurement. (The idealist philosopher perhaps feels like saying: 'I told you so all along!') Certainly there is a kind of permanent antinomy that baffles us when we try to think about time and space in the ordinary way; we cannot really imagine them as limited—some point where there is nothing beyond—nor as unlimited, infinitely prolonged.

Some would try to solve the paradox in strange ways. My dear old teacher, MacTaggart, the famous Hegelian, tried to cut the Gordian knot by denying the reality of 'time'; he maintained that reality consists only of 'spirit', but that we 'mis-perceive' the real through the illusion of the time-series and that is the explanation of 'evil' in the world! A bold statement, certainly; and one that I have neither space nor ability to examine, but must leave to Professor C. D. Broad and others. F. H. Bradley also taught that time is 'unreal'.

Much the same idea appears in Blake's saying: 'Time is the mercy of eternity.' Browning, if I am not mistaken, has made a similar suggestion through one of his characters. In other words, the ultimate reality, the infinite final glory would be too much for us poor humans, we could not bear it; it would shrivel us up.

The realm of *creative Art*, I believe, does help us in this problem of the real



meaning of time. The artists and poets often seem to possess a key, an intuition which is hidden from the abstract thinkers. What *is* the real meaning, the ideal of artistic creation, the so-called 'miracle of Art'? Blake's familiar lines suggest the unattainable aim:

*To see a World in a Grain of Sand . . . and Eternity in an hour.*

In other words, 'Eternity peeping through time'; the perfect expression of the eternal in the temporal, the infinite in the finite, 'the everywhere and always' in the 'here and now'. To one who believes in the living God (a belief which comes otherwise than by reasoning alone), the analogy of artistic creation and cosmic creation may be helpful and illuminating. For here is the divine artistry and its perfect expression in the great central fact of the Incarnation—God entering humanity, clothing Himself with our very flesh and blood. T. H. Green says: 'God is an act of eternal self-sacrifice, and Christ is the reproduction of that act under the conditions of space and time.' We should prefer to say: 'The Word became flesh and tabernacled amongst us; and we beheld His glory. . . .' We cannot grasp the mystery, but we hold to it that it was the divine Artist at work in holy, redeeming Love. No wonder the people exclaimed, as they watched Jesus the divine Healer at work upon the poor deaf-mute: 'How beautifully He does everything!' (The more usual rendering, 'He hath done all things well', hardly brings out the full meaning of the adverb.)

Here then is a clue, or at least an intimation, of the answer to the old question: What *is* Time? It cannot be merely duration, however essential the conventional idea of a uniform time-series may be in ordinary life. That involves us at once in seeming contradiction; the very idea of creation would be almost meaningless; also the idea of 'everlasting life', commonly understood to mean 'unending duration'. No wonder Lessing thought he had finally disproved the Incarnation, the great central fact for Christianity, by his simple statement: 'No event in time can possibly prove eternal truth.' Certainly, if you begin with the ordinary notion of time and try to work your way up from earthly things to Heavenly realities, that statement sounds convincing enough. But begin with the fact of the Incarnation, the supreme miracle of the divine Artist, then try to work down from that; and you find that certain things do become clearer: the problem of time is not so much solved as dissolved. We are still overshadowed by 'the cloud of unknowing', as one of the mystics said, but we do get hints, intimations of what the whole cosmic process means, and this through the 'Initiative of the Eternal'. We are bound to think of God as essentially timeless, unchanging, 'the everlasting now' ('I am that I am'), and yet for our minds as inseparable from the time-series. For time and eternity meet in the Incarnation; we can only apprehend the timeless through the temporal.

Frail pilgrims of time and mortality, we nevertheless partake of the divine Image: 'We feel that we are greater than we know.' Frustrated, hemmed in as we are by the flaming ramparts of the world of time and space, we can yet say with Browning's 'Grammarian': 'What's Time?' It may be real enough, but we are in touch with a greater reality. We feel already that Love demands Eternity and that each moment partakes of that timeless state. The seemingly 'real' is but the manifestation of that far more wonderful reality.

CHARLES GIMBLETT

## THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF SIN<sup>1</sup>

DR RYDER SMITH has amazed and delighted his many former students by the contributions he has made to the study of Biblical Theology since he retired from the Principalship of Richmond College in 1938. We had thought that he had given himself so assiduously to his work at the College that he must retire a very tired man. Whether that was so or not he has found it possible to publish several valuable books which contain the fruits of a lifetime of study. His latest book, like those that have preceded it, is characteristic of the man. It is a first-hand study of what the Bible teaches directly and indirectly about sin and, as one would expect from the great evangelist that Dr Ryder Smith is, the thought of God's gracious dealings with sinners is never far away.

Dr Ryder Smith has long been recognized as possessing the inestimable gift of being able to make difficult subjects appear simple, so simple in fact that it is possible to underestimate the profundity of the thought. The plan of this book is simple. The author first deals with the ideas of the biblical writers about God, for these are essential to a study of the conceptions of sin. The leading idea about God in the Bible is that He is King. The idea of God's Fatherhood must be understood in the light of his Kingship.

Next, the many terms used to characterize sin are analysed and a careful examination is made of some of the salient passages in which they occur. There follows a very interesting section on 'Opposites' in which the terms for sin are set over against the terms used to characterize the 'good life'. There follows a study of the universality of sin, original sin, sin in societies and finally sinfulness.

Lastly the author discusses the two ways of God with sinners. These are described as punishment and plea, except that in the New Testament section they are given as warning and plea.

This order of treatment is followed in all three sections of the book, namely The Old Testament, The Apocrypha, and The New Testament.

In the study of punishment, for example, the author shows that God is occasionally said to hate the wicked but far more frequently to hate wickedness. The righteous, unlike God, make a practice of hating the wicked because they are the enemies of God. 'It is as though life were an internecine struggle between the friends and enemies of God.'

Though God is rarely said to be the enemy of the wicked he is often said to be angry with them, with a royal, righteous anger, but His anger 'is usually with the Israel that He loves', and the only ground of His anger is sin. Further, His anger finds expression in punishment now. Only in one late passage (Daniel 12a) does the wrath of God refer to a future age. As God is just and never acts arbitrarily the word retribution is to be preferred to vengeance in such passages as Isaiah 1a and 61a. In these and all similar passages the reference is to retribution within history.

The Apocrypha continues the Old Testament teaching though it 'creeps a little nearer to the idea' that God hates sin but not sinners.

In the New Testament the references to punishment, for the most part, relate to the future. God and His Son, and therefore Christians, love their enemies whereas the latter hate Christians and Christ, and therefore God. In many passages, however, where the word hate occurs, the meaning is nothing more than 'chose

another'. Examples are the saying of Jesus that a man must hate father and mother, and the Pauline saying: 'Jacob I loved but Esau I hated.' 'In the New Testament God loves every man and hates none.'

The idea of the universality of sin is carefully discussed in all three sections. Dr Smith reaches the conclusion that 'in all periods the ordinary or typical Hebrew believed that, both in the past and the present, there were a very few sinless men'. There is no suggestion that any man is wholly sinful. 'It is usually counted obvious that just as good men sometimes do wrong, so bad men sometimes do right.' This outlook also pervades the Apocrypha. In the New Testament the universality of sin is assumed. If all men were asked, 'Do you fully follow the Sermon on the Mount?' or 'Do you come short of the glory of God?' their reply would show them to be aware of sin in their lives.

The book contains a very discerning study of sinfulness. The predominant idea among the Hebrews was that only the wrong act is sin. In experience, sin as act follows plan, plan follows will, will follows desire, and desire follows knowledge. All agree that the act is sinful and that knowledge of sin is not sinful. Discussion centres on desire, choice, and plan. Esau was held blameworthy for desiring to kill Jacob, whether he carried out the murder or not, but it was Jeremiah and Ezekiel who first clearly saw that sin is primarily inward and that it can only be cured by a change of heart. The tenth commandment, however, points in the same direction, but the clearest expression of the conception of sinfulness is in Psalm 51.

In the New Testament again the voluntary element is prominent, though the increased stress on motive brings the idea of sinfulness into prominence. An analysis of Romans 7 leads to the conclusion that 'sin is a disease of the will and unless Christ cures it, a fatal disease'.

With regard to the characterization of sin itself Dr Smith holds that throughout the Bible sin is 'primarily disobedience to a personal God'.

*The Bible Doctrine of Sin*, like Dr Smith's other books, requires careful study. Its wealth of detail cannot yield an adequate reward to a hasty reader though the wayfaring man will have no difficulty in seeing the plan. It should be read with the Bible at hand all the time. The book would have benefited by some attention being given to the conclusions of other writers in this field, but the author has kept to his title and has given us what the Bible has to say about sin.

We welcome this thoroughly factual and first-hand study of a subject on which it is exceedingly important that we seek the greatest clarity that is within our reach.

PERCY SCOTT

<sup>1</sup> The Epworth Press, 20s. (202 pp.).

---

## Recent Literature

Edited by C. RYDER SMITH

*Lachish III: The Iron Age*—The Wellcome-Marston Archaeological Research Expedition to the Near East. (Oxford University Press, Text and Plates, 8 guineas.)

These two books, comprising the third volume of the Report of the Wellcome-Marston Expedition to the Near East, deal with the three periods of the Iron Age. The fourth and final volume will be concerned with the preceding Bronze Age. Unfortunately the work was interrupted by the imminence of the second World War, the headquarters, closed in 1938, was subsequently destroyed by Bedouin raiders, and the railway equipment was sold when Rommel advanced toward Egypt. The excavations were made on the site of Tell-ed-Duweir, believed to be the ancient city of Lachish. When the late J. L. Starkey undertook the work he hoped it might reveal certain sources of the foreign influences which affected Palestinian culture. It was his ambition to discover the origins of the Sea Peoples, and perhaps establish their contacts with Egypt and Mesopotamia in earliest times. With the support of Sir Henry Wellcome, Sir Charles Marston, and Sir Robert Mond, the work was undertaken and carried through successfully until it had to be abandoned. The objects recovered were numerous and varied, and from them it is possible to reconstruct, in considerable detail, the life of an important city of Judah. The findings come from several clearly defined levels. The city described was evidently a trading centre until it was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in 586 B.C. The contents of tombs and the debris of rubbish-heaps contribute much valuable information, especially for the period covered by the biblical books of Kings, Chronicles, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. In a room in the city on the Second Level, for example, the *ostraca*, with writing in ink which is fairly legible, furnish us with a collection of letters written in the time of Jeremiah, which are in themselves a treasure. The book, with its beautifully reproduced pictures of the actual 'finds', will be invaluable to all serious students of the period. It is admirably written by Olga Tufnell, with contributions by Margaret A. Murray and David Diringer.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

*The Disciple who Wrote these things*, by H. E. Edwards. (James Clarke & Co., 12s. 6d.)  
*Towards an understanding of the Gospels*, by Edward Smalley. (The Epworth Press, 6s. 6d.)

In the first book Canon Edwards gives the evidence which has convinced him that the Fourth Gospel represents the early tradition of the Jerusalem Church, spoken in the first place to the group of Christians who fled to Pella shortly before the Jewish War began. This oral teaching was written down by one who was present, who forty years later selected passages from what he had written, and made a book out of them, to convince a class of inquirers at Ephesus of the truth of Christianity. The first draft of the Gospel, if it can be called that, was the discourse of an eye witness of the events and an ear witness of the words which the Gospel records. This witness was John, son of Zebedee, 'the beloved disciple'. Admitting the difficulty that a fisherman of Galilee would not have had the *entrée* to the house of the High Priest, Canon Edwards thinks that the 'other disciple' named in that story is not the beloved disciple but another, to whom is to be ascribed the account of what took place in the High Priest's house, and many topographical details connected with Jerusalem, which are a feature of the Gospel. This 'other disciple' may have been called 'John', and may have been the 'reporter and editor' of the documents which go to form the Gospel. Hence the confusion of the two 'Johns' in Christian tradition. Canon Edwards claims that his theories are derived from accepting the statements of the Gospel as they stand, including the words in which the author sums up his purpose: 'These things are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ.' The

evidence on which his book is based has, up to the present, Canon Edwards claims, escaped the notice of scholars. It might be wiser to say that the evidence has been differently interpreted. But his book does put a new emphasis on certain words in the Gospel, and is persuasively written. It will send readers back to think again about some of the more familiar modern theories which are often mistaken for facts. It is, however, no more free from unproved hypotheses than most other books on the Fourth Gospel.

The second book, of less than 100 pages, is designed, and admirably suited, for groups whose members are eager to know more about the four Gospels that they may read them more intelligently. The author begins with an interesting and enlightening chapter on 'The Background'. He goes on to describe how the Synoptic Gospels came to be written. He has not hesitated to find room for full quotations of parallel passages, instead of merely giving references and leaving the readers to look them up. This is all to the good. He then points out what essential elements each Gospel contributes to the picture of our Lord, and concludes with two chapters on the Fourth Gospel. This little book will enlighten and reassure thoughtful readers. Everything in it is designed to lead them to the understanding of the spiritual values enshrined in the Gospels. F. B. CLOGG

*The Image of God in Man*, by David Cairns. (S.C.M., 18s.).

This book deals with a subject that is right at the centre of theological debate at the present time. Prof. Cairns examines the biblical basis of the doctrine, certain Hellenistic views which have considerably influenced Christian thought, and the teaching of some leading theologians, ancient, medieval and modern. Two chapters, devoted to the Marxian and Freudian conceptions of man, compare and contrast them with Christian views. These are particularly welcome, as many theologians and philosophers, though dealing with the same questions, go their own way completely heedless of what is being said by others. We should have welcomed much more than a passing reference to what Prof. D. H. Lewis has to say on this subject. Prof. Cairns supports the widely held view that there are two conceptions of the image of God in man in the Bible. In the Old Testament the 'image' means a 'personal responsible existence before God'. Although the doctrine of the Covenant obscured the universal reference, Prof. Cairns maintains that this idea 'has a secure lodgement' in it. This conception is peripheral in the New Testament, where the prevailing conception of the 'image' is likeness to Christ. This distinction seems to us to be valid and of great significance. Particular attention is devoted to Brunner and Barth. Brunner's distinction between the formal image, by which he means the humanity of man, and the material image, by which he means likeness to Christ—the former remaining in unbelievers whereas the latter is completely lost—is clearly brought out. This distinction Barth rejects as well as the idea of a universal Logos-relation to all mankind. Barth's interpretation is exclusively Christo-centric, though he admits that there are analogies of the true interpretation of the image in the relation of man and woman, and of a man to his neighbour. Prof. Cairns gives a short history of Barth's thought on this subject and holds, with Brunner, that there has been a 'massive change' in it. It will surprise many to see Barth described as a 'great humanist and liberal', but the claim is not entirely without foundation. The final chapter, on the dignity of man, finds the ground of this in the fact that God loves him. PERCY SCOTT

*Early Christian Fathers*, Edited by Cyril C. Richardson. (S.C.M., 30s.)

This first volume of the *Library of Christian Classics* will be given a cordial welcome, partly because of the revived interest in Patristics, partly for its intrinsic merits, and still more because it is an earnest of studies to come. The publication of a series of selected classical Christian texts, edited and (re)translated, with the addition of notes and bibliography, will meet a long-felt need. This 'Library' of twenty-six volumes is to cover the period from Christian beginnings to that of the English Reformers, and the list of editorial contributors is a sufficient guarantee of the high scholastic standard to be maintained.



While one may regret the exclusion of certain Christian writings, on the whole the selection has been judiciously made. The production is especially pleasing. Here in Volume 1 we have the writings of representative early Christian Fathers classified in an interesting way: Letters in Crises (1 Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp), the Way of Martyrdom (the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*), a Church Manual (the *Didache*), an Early Christian Sermon (2 Clement), *In Defence of the Faith* (*Diognetus*), Justin's *First Apology* (Athenagoras), an Exposition of the Faith (selections from Irenaeus' *Against Heresies*). Dr Richardson in an introductory essay brings out some important points—for example, that almost the whole of second-century Christian literature was penned by Gentiles and that the epistolary form was the predominant type. Space will allow only brief comments. The translations tend at times to be somewhat paraphrastic, but are fresh and often felicitous. Brief but helpful notes are appended. A valuable feature of the bibliographies is the list of important monographs and articles on the treatise concerned. P. N. Harrison's division and dating of the *Letter of Polycarp to the Philippians* is 'open to rebuttal'. What is commonly called Clement's *Second Letter to the Corinthians* is of especial interest as being the earliest Christian sermon extant. In Justin's *First Apology* he 'opens (the door of the church) and tells a good deal about what goes on inside'. Dr Eugene R. Fairweather, who edits the *Letter to Diognetus*, accepts Dom P. Andriessen's view that its first ten chapters were written by Quadratus in Asia Minor. Some of the parallels between *Diognetus* and the Johannine literature seem a little forced—for example, *Diognetus* 12 and Revelation 22. More account might have been taken of the strong Pauline influence on the *Letter*. To the bibliography may now be added *A Diognète* by H. I. Marrou (1951). The lacuna which occurs at 7, is twice placed at 7; and the reference on p.207 should be John 15 (not 16). These minor points, however, in no way detract from the excellence of this volume, which sets a high standard for the whole series.

H. G. MEECHAM

*Zwingli and Bullinger*, Selected Translations with Introductions and Notes by G. W. Bromiley. (The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XXIV, S.C.M., 30s.)

This volume in the *Library of Christian Classics*, which promises to be of incalculable value to all students of Church History, sheds light in a dark place. This is the first really good book in English about Zwingli of Zurich. He has been widely suspected of an intellectualism that diminished the value of his reforming work; his writings lack Luther's fire and Calvin's system; he died on the battlefield before his reforms came to full fruition. The translations from his works in this book should give him his true, and very important, place in Christian history. They show him as the pioneer of many ideas and movements which were later developed by others, and the performer of solid and lasting good in the Church of Zurich which had influence far and wide. Mr Bromiley's excellent historical introduction gives a lucid account of Zwingli's theology, and in particular clears his sacramental doctrine of the charge of so-called 'Zwinglianism', the view that the Sacraments are 'bare signs' and the Lord's Supper a mere memorial. The works selected for translation are—'Of the clarity and certainty of the Word of God', 'Of the education of youth', 'Of Baptism', 'Of the Lord's Supper', and 'An exposition of the faith'. All of them, fairly translated, show a vigorous mind, which, while inclined to diffuseness, was well aware of those spiritual issues which are as alive now as in the time of the Reformation.

Heinrich Bullinger is probably even less known in this country than Zwingli. He continued and stabilized his fore-runner's work in Zurich, where he was 'people's priest' for forty-four years. He also exercised considerable influence on the English Reformers. Though a trifle pedestrian, he was a statesman of ecumenical and moderate spirit. All these characteristics come out in the work translated in this volume, 'Of the holy catholic Church', which expounds the doctrine of the Church held by the central Reformers in plain and systematic outline.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

*God Hidden and Revealed*, by John Dillenberger. (Mühlenberg Press, Philadelphia, \$2.50).

This book undertakes to investigate 'the interpretation of Luther's *Deus Absconditus* and its significance for religious thought'. While it is 'historical in the sense of surveying the forces from Ritschl to Barth', it is 'systematic in raising the historical questions in the context of a theological interest which is more extensive than history'. The development of Luther research in Germany is traced throughout the last century, from Ritschl and Harnack to Holl, Kattenbusch and the Seebergs, from Heim, Hirsch, Althaus and Elert to Barth and Brunner, with a separate section on Rudolf Otto ('God revealed as the Wholly Other'), and with special reference to the scholastic antecedents and general philosophical implications of Luther's terminology. Professor Tillich concludes his foreword by saying that 'theologians concerned with the reformulation of the doctrine of God, ministers struggling to impart the presence of God in his infinite majesty, and interested laymen who have mastered minimal theological concepts will find Dr Dillenberger's book indispensable'. It is difficult to contest recommendations of such weight as these. The reviewer, whose primary interest is in Luther himself and who remains a layman where his twentieth-century exponents are concerned, must be pardoned for his inability to master minimal theological concepts when in the final summing-up he is faced with the sentence: 'The correlation of hiddenness and revelation, as apprehended in faith, points rather to the affirmation of the ungraspable nature of God in integral relation to his disclosure.' Surely we have travelled a long way from the lucidity of, say, Theodosius Harnack! Again, at least an introductory chapter on Luther's own statements (with more detailed reference to *Anfechtung*), and a tabulated list of the several meanings of 'hiddenness' and 'revelation', as employed with greater or lesser consistency by the various authors, would have been of real benefit to the uninitiated reader. One is tempted to speculate what kind of review Luther might have written of his reviewers and what kind of answer he might have given to the one who 'thought it was not yet clear that the *Deus Absconditus* is really the *Deus Revelatus*'! Is it quite fanciful to suspect that he would have asked for scriptural references in the first place, and that without these the struggling minister of today will find it impossible to make either sense or sermon of the doctrine in question?

FRANZ HILDEBRANDT

*Hugh Latimer*, by Harold S. Darby. (The Epworth Press, 21s.)

In this book Harold Darby has left us a legacy which will endure for many years. It combines all his gifts of graphic expression and thoughtful interpretation; and it is a book about a preacher by a preacher, so that, while it is never obtusely hortatory, it follows the good Methodist biographical tradition of edification. We must be grateful that it appears just before the fourth centenary of the English Protestant Martyrs, since, for a century now, a prejudice against them has been part of the Catholic and Anglo-Catholic view of history. Here we see Latimer as a giant—a great Christian, a great Protestant, a great preacher, a great Englishman—from those spring years of the dawning Reformation when, as a truculent young 'spike', he had interfered, an insufferable nuisance, in the biblical lectures of his contemporaries, right down to the tragic beauty of the last minutes of his life, when, ancient, gaunt and stooping, he plucked out an image in a dozen words, greater than any of his famous sermons, ultimate, immortal. There was not much original to be done or said about Hugh Latimer. John Foxe, the Parker Society's edition of his remains, the vast storehouse of the State Papers, give us the printed sources, and if there are still one or two chronological puzzles, it may be that they are insoluble. But here is the account of Latimer's career, illuminating the story of all the Reformers, the early troubles under Wolsey, the startling intervention of that royal favour which again and again was a talisman of safety, and the time of his episcopate, never for him the satisfying office, but beset behind and before with the preaching which was his supreme gift and delight, preaching in the great old medieval tradition but also

in the new evangelical way, homely and vivid and completely fearless. Latimer was not the last man to be bolder in the pulpit than in a committee, but, if in some committees he signed some documents which read curiously today and are a problem for his admirers, there is no doubt that in the pulpit he was bold as a lion, and his tongue the most feared in England. One of the joys of this book is that it is another effective blow against the fashionable interpretation of the Reformation as a combined operation of money-grabbing touts and ecclesiastical 'spivs'. Here Hugh Latimer uses very plain English as a very plain Englishman to rebuke injustice in high places. While the story is not all thrilling, and while Latimer was involved in a good many affairs and controversies which were humdrum and can only be reported in a humdrum way, Harold Darby uses his descriptive powers with a scholarly restraint and his moving paragraphs come really home. The last two chapters are to be read and re-read. We who live in a time when nothing less is demanded of us than the Reform of Reformation itself, will find much to hearten us in this story. Its main burden is that the Word of God and the Spirit of God are moving, directing, living and energizing powers, and that simple faith and courage are invincible. The proof reading and the careful index have been a labour of love from friends. For me, as for them, this book is a link in the communion of saints, that binds us both with Latimer and with Harold Darby.

GORDON RUPP

*George Whitefield—The Awakener*, by Albert D. Belden. (Rockliff Publishing Corporation, 30s.)

It was fitting that the only modern study of George Whitefield should have been written when Dr Belden was minister of 'Whitefield's Tabernacle'. His book, written in 1923 and long out of print, has now appeared in a second edition from a new publisher. It is styled a 'revised' edition, but the only revisions we can detect are the omission of the Foreword by Ramsay MacDonald, the re-writing of parts of the Introductory Chapter to harmonize with the contemporary religious and political scene, and a new List of Illustrations made necessary by a rearrangement of their order. Some of the footnotes are out of date, and the Index is quite inadequate by present-day standards. Nevertheless, though the price is high, the new publishers have produced a book of technical excellence, admirably illustrated, and a joy to handle. The biography itself has stood the test of time. Mr Belden admitted that it contained little new information. His desire being 'to quicken the forces of revival in religious society', he called Whitefield 'The Awakener', a title used in rather irritating profusion. The story of Whitefield is faithfully told—his work in America, second only to that of Asbury himself, the revivals in Scotland and Wales, his controversy with Wesley, and their reconciliation. All this is, so to say, the text which is expounded in the last quarter of the book, where the author examines the theological, ethical, psychological, and sociological implications of the Revival. His conclusions are as valid today as when they were written. This edition deserves as wide a circle of readers as the first.

WESLEY F. SWIFT

*Friends for Three-hundred-years: Beliefs and Practice of the Society of Friends*, by Howard Brinton. (Geo. Allen and Unwin. 15s.)

*The Writings of Robert Harrison and Robert Browne*, edited by Albert Peel and Leland H. Carlson. (Geo. Allen and Unwin. 35s.)

Of these two outstanding volumes religious freedom and the dignity of the human spirit is the common theme. Mr Brinton gives us a lucid and fascinating 'apology' for the Society of Friends, with its distinctive beliefs and practices. By notable incidents in their lives and apposite quotations from their writings we are introduced to many of the leading Quakers, from the days of George Fox through times of persecution to the liberty of today. Throughout this impressive book we are in the presence of Jesus Christ, the Light of the World, illuminating the spiritual understanding, enriching the experience and shining through the lives of those who truly receive Him. There are clear expositions

of the doctrines of the Inner Light and the priesthood of all believers, a defence of Non-Resistance and an interesting explanation of the Quaker attitude toward the Sacraments. The value of the Quiet Meeting is convincingly set forth and profound respect manifested for the individual conscience. We learn much too about the magnificent social service rendered by Friends. Doctrines and practices alike are discussed in the face of possible objections, and the questions of Authority and the claims of Reason and Revelation are luminously presented. Although the phraseology may occasionally be unfamiliar to the devoted Methodist, there is little in this book that will not appeal to his spiritual susceptibilities, or to those of Free Churchmen generally. The Quaker is more apprehensive of the dangers of forms and ceremonies than the average Methodist, but in other respects they occupy very much common ground. We close this heart-searching book mentally invigorated and spiritually refreshed. Young ministers might, to their great advantage, include it in their book-list.

For the student of religious freedom and Free Church principles the second volume is of prime importance and value. It will almost certainly remain unchallenged as a source book. Here, for the first time, are collected all the extant writings of two men who wrought sacrificially to lay the foundations of our religious liberties. Of special value is the *True and Short Declaration* of that enigmatical pioneer of Congregationalism, Robert Browne, in which, through the autobiographical details, we can trace the development of the basic conceptions of Dissent. The retention of the original spelling will, for many, add to the charm of this outstanding example of scholarly editorial work.

W. L. DOUGHTY

*Quakers and Education As seen in their Schools in England*, by W. A. Campbell-Stewart. (The Epworth Press, 30s.)

The Professor of Education in the new University College of North Staffordshire has made a sympathetically critical study of the history of Quaker schools from their earliest days. Retrospects are always liable to distort, and Prof Stewart has wisely prefixed a careful statement of Quaker beliefs, practices and purposes when their schools were founded. As the story unfolds he glances at the changes within the Society of Friends itself and the far-reaching changes in the educational and social environment which have steadily modified practices in Quaker schools and their courses of training. The very nature of Quaker beliefs raises problems in education. Faith in the Inner Light; respect for the personality of the individual; belief in the immanence of God in each human spirit; recognition of inward guidance through silent communion; the absence of sacraments, symbolism and liturgy; the exclusion from the community of any form of authoritarianism or 'psychical' violence in matters of religion; the sense, especially in early days, of separateness, all these raised the question 'By what means were Quaker beliefs and principles to be nourished and safeguarded in the young?' The answer was found in a guarded education, with a strong vocational bias and a utilitarian trend toward service and austere discipline. While there was suspicion of 'intellectual learning', in the early days, the classical languages were regarded favourably. Later divergence between the Quaker and the grammar-schools became marked; and no doubt the exclusion of dissenters from the universities was one cause of Quaker schools going their own narrow way. There was a time when young friends learned Latin from 'books written by friends, full of Quaker precepts', but even then they were, says Prof Stewart, 'in the right sea even if they hated water'. Problems are not yet at an end and this informative treatise closes with a few vital questions. Central among them is this: 'Is there any Quaker difference in these days which justifies separatism?' From the curricular point of view Prof Stewart answers 'No'; but if Friends desire separation for religious or communal reasons, they must decide whether this still requires that they must maintain separate schools at their own expense.

J. VERNON RATCLIFFE

*The Sacraments in Methodism*, by Robert W. Goodloe.

*Stewardship in Methodism*, by Boyd M. McKeown. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$1.75 each).

Dr Goodloe reminds us that Methodism cherishes her place in the Historic Church—the Body of Christ and the body of believers. Her charter is summed up in Ephs. 2, and he gives a good exposition of Grace and Faith as essential factors in Salvation. Preaching and the Sacraments are the 'Means' of bringing the fact of the grace of God to men's minds and of kindling faith. The writer freely uses Wesley to support his reasons for writing on 'The Sacraments'. An excellent chapter on 'The Lord's Supper' is in full accord with the convictions of universal Methodism. His plea for the children of believing parents to attend Holy Communion with them is to be heartily commended. 'Let them come with their elders.' Another plea for 'Preaching upon the Lord's Supper' is very timely. There are surprisingly few differences in the conduct of the service in America and England. On the Sacrament of Baptism Dr Goodloe is particularly helpful. He reminds us of the strong Gentile influence in the early centuries and of the fact that Infant Baptism has continuity with all the religions of mankind. A lucid exposition and justification of Infant Baptism follows, and useful chapters on Modes of Baptism (and on Ordination) are included. This book will be of special value to younger ministers.

Anything that can help in these days of financial 'crisis' in Methodism is most welcome. Dr Boyd McKeown rightly emphasizes the conception of 'Stewardship', which is a Christian idea, and which ought to underlie all our personal and communal life, especially in monetary matters. We expect our American friends to be able to talk on this subject and are ready for a slick and streamlined account of it. It would not be easy to name any British Methodist who could write a book like this; hence it would be difficult to adduce reasons why it should not be carefully read. A Church can never be run on a purely commercial basis and this book will help in the understanding of consecrated finance.

C. LESLIE BREWER

*The Pilgrim Church: an Account of the First Five Years in the Life of the Church of South India*, by A. Marcus Ward. (The Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

The Church of South India, which some call 'a piece of grit in the ecumenical oyster', has had much written on it from outside. But here is a comprehensive and well-documented account from within, of what the new Church has been thinking and doing in these five years. As Professor of Theology in the United Theological College, Bangalore, Mr Ward is admirably qualified for such interpretation, and has given us a thorough objective study in 214 pages, with no purple patches and very little argument. Two or three impressions stand out most vividly. First there is the claim that the main aim of this Union was evangelism, and that many signs show that the C.S.I. is increasing in evangelistic effectiveness—e.g. the first committee set up by the Synod was the Board of Missions. Second, there comes the impressive testimony to the impetus given by Union to theological thinking—e.g. in a united Church, with its several traditions, appeals to mere tradition are at a discount and students are driven back upon the New Testament, with a new emphasis on present guidance of the Holy Spirit. Third, there stands out the profound sense of enrichment which the C.S.I. is experiencing—e.g. in the brief discussion of what Episcopacy is coming to mean in its life, and in the treatment of the new forms of worship authorized for experimental use, especially the Liturgy for Holy Communion, which has deeply impressed many who have studied and used it outside India. 'Union', says Mr Ward, 'does not mean compromise, but restoration: differences need not separate but can enrich.' There are also valuable chapters on Women's Movements, on Conversations with Lutherans and Baptists, and on the Problem of Indian Leadership, with four useful appendices. While the many quotations, chiefly from official records, might have been more plainly indicated, otherwise the book is well produced. Those who study it seriously will be richly rewarded.

BASIL CLUTTERBUCK



*Brett's History of Psychology*, abridged edition in one volume, edited and revised by R. S. Peters. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 42s.)

Brett's three-volume *History of Psychology* was one of those omnibus works which are found only in libraries and on the shelves of the experts. It began with primitive thought, swept through the Greek philosophers, dipped into the East, analysed the psychology of the Fathers, passed through the speculation of the Middle Ages, and took the story up to 1921. That was before the hey-day of Freud, and before the extensive development of experimental, industrial and educational psychology in the past generation. It was obviously necessary to bring the book up to date, and the average student does not need so full an account of speculation in the days before psychology became a science as Brett gave. Mr Peters, therefore, set himself to abbreviate, and he has done so in a wise way. He has left out a good deal of the earlier part, providing a list of omissions, but he has not attempted to re-write the book. We still have some information about Greek, early Christian, and medieval thought, and about the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries up to the beginnings of modern psychology in the nineteenth. Mr Peters writes a short preface to each section, and then lets Brett speak for himself. He has, however, written the first chapter, on Theory, Policy and Technology, and most of the last, on Twentieth-century Trends, two of his assistants contributing sections upon matter of which they have special knowledge, the physiological side and educational tests. In several respects the abridged edition has the advantage of the earlier work. Not only is it more handy in size and up-to-date, but, as a whole, the omitted sections are not likely to be much missed. Brett's main interest was philosophy rather than psychology, and accordingly he gave much more attention to earlier thinkers who, like himself, were primarily philosophers, than would a modern psychologist. The section on modern trends is well done and harmonizes with the work of the original writer much more than is the case sometimes. It is descriptive rather than critical, but it does point out where criticism can be made. In short, Mr Peters has produced a book that will now be almost indispensable to the student of psychology.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

*Christian Faith and Social Action*. A Symposium edited by John A. Hutchinson. (Charles Scribner's Sons, 21s.)

This handsomely produced volume contains thirteen essays by a group of Christian scholars in the United States. A preface tells the story of this group, which began as a Fellowship of Socialist Christians, decided that 'Socialism in any precise sense of the word was no real cure for the ills of society', and so on. The book includes a fair amount of recantation of earlier doctrines. It now centres round Reinhold Niebuhr, who himself writes one of the most interesting chapters. His thought dominates both the group and the book. Some of the most interesting essays are by writers already well known in this country. There is, for example, a valuable study of 'The Person in a Technical Society' by Paul Tillich, a useful introduction to the 'Doctrine of Vocation' by Alexander Miller, and a discussion of 'The Christian Gospel and History' by Roger L. Shinn, which is typical of Niebuhr's position and critical of John Baillie's defence of the idea of progress as a Christian belief. Whilst one or two essays border on the naïve, the book as a whole deserves serious consideration and is a good example of group-thinking. Critical alike of pietistic escape from social concern and of 'the Social Gospel Movement', the writers wrestle with the relation between Christian faith and social judgements and actions. Distrustful of all forms of perfectionism, uneasy about any light-hearted attempt to 'apply Christian principles' or to assume that new men automatically produce a new world, they seek to suggest ways by which, recollecting that 'there is moral ambiguity in every possible political and economic position', the law of love may yet be applied to man's collective relations. As we should expect from Niebuhr's disciples, the writers maintain that there is no way of escape from the Christian responsibility for decision and

action in social matters. Whether or not the main propositions of this Symposium carry conviction, the discussion merits the attention of all who believe that Christian faith must 'express its love for God and neighbour through faithful activity in history'. The book is a reminder that much more strenuous thinking and more resolute action—even with the awareness (so frequently stressed by the writers) that all our judgements are liable to error and subject to the need for revision—are demanded from Christians today. Only a little of the book is specially directed to an American audience. A curious misprint in the Table of Contents reads like a parody of the title of the last book by Brunner, who in fact receives trenchant criticism by one essayist.

FREDERICK GREEVES

*These Things Remain*, by Carlyle Marney. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2).

*The Great Argument*, by Lynn Harold Hough. (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.)

*The Faith that is in Us*, by John Huxtable. (Independent Press, 5s.)

The two Transatlantic books are utterly different except for a common concern for the state of the world. Dr Hough views it from a tower of refuge, Carlyle Marney from a battle-tank in action, crashing alike through friend and foe, world and Church. 'We have built for ourselves a mare's nest of a cage into which He could not come if He would. . . . His brotherhood—of believing hearts—has become largely in our day a fat old lady, sitting in a rock-ribbed castle, counting war bonds' is a fair example of his vehemence. Presumably the typographical eccentricities are intended to arrest attention, but the unbridled language would be quite enough without them. Altogether as startling, provocative and over-emphasized a set of sermons as one could discover, but there are readers for whom they will serve their purpose well. Dr Hough's series is mercifully more restrained but not without duplication (e.g. pages 41 and 63 are strangely alike). The sermons were all preached in this country and will be welcomed by many who have heard this preacher during his thirty visits to Britain. The Rev. John Huxtable provides thoughtful sermons. They are perhaps a trifle dogmatic and Barthian, but they will be useful so far as they go, though one cannot adequately expound 'faith' and 'The Holy Spirit' in three thousand words. The writer, however, only claims to provide a very sketchy outline, and every preacher knows the difficulty of condensation.

HAROLD MALLINSON

*A Doctor Heals by Faith*, by Christopher Woodward. (Max Parrish, 12s. 6d.)

Although the author of this book protests that his faith in Divine Healing in no way invalidates his acceptance and use of medicine and surgery, the impression that his book gives is one of great *naïveté*, and in general, it does not differ in tone and content from those written by faith-healers with no medical qualifications. There is the same woolly religious language, where the attentive reader looks for clear and precise description. The simplicity of the author's cast of mind appears, for instance, in his surprise that wonderful things should occur at Lourdes but not in Palestine during the last two thousand years, although our Lord walked there, and in his deriving great consolation from the claim of radiaesthesia (source not given) that making the sign of the Cross over a person makes a difference in his bodily radiations. The writer seems to have no expert psychological knowledge. Though he knows that, among the many, many thousands who have journeyed to Lourdes in the last eighty years there have only been forty-eight cases of 'miraculous' healing, he says nothing of the colossal problem of the disappointed, as depicted, for instance, in Dr Weatherhead's grim eye-witness description of the train *back*. Nevertheless, the writer's stories of cures have a human and religious interest. Yet, instead of triumphant assertions that prayer can cure anything, do we not need more light on the nature of the cases where prayer seems to have been effective and orthodox medicine and psychology have not?

ERASTUS EVANS

# From My New Shelf

By C. RYDER SMITH.

*The Thought of the Prophets*, by Rabbi Israel I. Mattuck (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 9s. 6d.). In this account of the teaching of the 'Written Prophets' Rabbi Mattuck, the eminent exponent of Liberal Judaism, assuming the findings of modern scholarship, shows that, while the Prophets spoke to their contemporaries, they were the pioneers who blazed the trail for all the theists of today. He shows too how they learnt the truth, not by ratiocination, but by revelation. While on a few debated subjects—e.g. 'the Servant of the Lord'—the Rabbi, of course, has to speak for himself, and while his style is almost too sober, he gives a clear exposition of the Prophets' unique and many-sided contribution to true religion.

*The Names of Jesus*, by Vincent Taylor (Macmillan & Co., 12s. 6d.). It is good news that Dr Vincent Taylor is to give us three series of Speaker's Lectures under the titles 'The Names of Jesus', 'Jesus of Nazareth: His Life and Ministry', and 'The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching'. In this first volume, being convinced that an 'examination of names and titles is a necessary prelude to the study of the Person of Christ', he examines fifty-five names, beginning with 'Jesus' and ending with 'The Word' and 'the Amen'. He divides the titles into 'the Principal Names' and 'Others' (and I am at a loss for the criterion of division, but this is a small matter). Under 'Other Names' he has useful sub-divisions. I should like to ask two questions—Ought not there to have been more than a foot-note on 'Apostle', with its verb 'sent'? Is it not possible that 'John' made an attempt to render the Hebrew *go'el* into Greek under '*paracletos*'? Again, Dr Taylor's re-distribution of the Parousia sayings has not yet convinced me. But his thoroughness and lucidity and insight are all here once more. While his primary purpose is to collect data for the doctrine of the Person of Christ, he has also furnished much gold for the preacher's crucible. Ought there not to be an index of texts?

*A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity*, by G. A. F. Knight (Oliver & Boyd, 6s.). In this brochure of seventy-eight pages, the first of a series of 'Occasional Papers' to be issued by *The Scottish Journal of Theology*, Prof Knight shows that the right approach to the doctrine of the Trinity, as implied in the New Testament, is from the Old. He examines the Hebraic use of such terms as 'Name', 'Face', 'Angel', 'Shekinah' and 'Spirit', rightly claiming that they suggest the concept of 'organism' within the unity of God. Sometimes, as under 'Son' and 'Dove', he rather over-states his case. Further, while he again and again decries the use of Greek concepts in the attempt to define the doctrine of the Trinity, he himself repeatedly uses the words 'essence' and 'metaphysics', and are not these concepts of Greek origin? He assumes that for the Hebrew 'body' and 'flesh' were synonyms, and even ascribes an incomprehensible 'spiritual flesh' to God! He denies that Hebrew has a word for 'plan', forgetting *chashab*. He says that 'none of the great classic theological statements includes a phrase to declare that God is love', but what of 'Father'? I find that I have queried a score of other statements, though mostly on small points. None the less a wary reader will again and again find this brochure illuminating.

*Eschatology*, Four Papers read to the Society for the Study of Theology (Oliver & Boyd, 6s.). The word 'eschatology' here means 'the doctrine of the last thing', the final Kingdom of God, in its relation to the present world-order. It includes 'the last things'—such as Judgement, Resurrection, Hell—which used to be called 'eschatology', but little is said of these particular subjects here. The first paper, on 'The Eschatology of the New Testament', is by Prof William Manson. When he writes that 'the apostolic reply' to the question 'When will Christ come again?' is 'Not yet the End', ought he not

to have said 'Not yet—but soon', and does not this raise a problem pertinent today? There is no need to say that he once more lucidly 'puts across' expert findings. In the next two papers, on 'Early Patristic Eschatology' and 'The Eschatology of the Reformation', Profs G. W. H. Lampe and T. F. Torrance guide our steps skilfully along rarely trodden paths. The latter even makes Luther's scattered and difficult teachings approximately clear! The Rev. W. A. Whitehouse writes the last paper, on 'The Modern Discussion of Eschatology', showing first what has so far been gained, and then, at greater length, what still awaits the doing. He makes a challenging distinction between three things—true 'time', proper to God and to men who are like Him, Platonic 'timelessness', and 'fallen time', in which the present evil world lies. His grasp of his subject, in its many various parts, is masterly indeed. If I may use the word, this small book is an excellent propaedeutic for all students of the current discussion of eschatology, and, indeed, of the whole doctrine of history, for eschatology is a part of history'

*Religion as Salvation*, by Harris Franklin Rall (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$3). This book contains a short account of the doctrines of 'Man' and 'Sin', and a longer one of the doctrine of 'Salvation', taken in its widest sense. For example, the Sacraments and the Church are included. The volume is a very able exposition and defence of the Evangelical Faith in modern terms, even though there are a few weak points—e.g. the treatment of the doctrines of the Atonement and the Spirit is inadequate. Dr Rall has read widely and taken the measure of much modern thought. He knows how to be both brief and clear—a rare gift.

*Plotinus*, by A. H. Armstrong (George Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.). Over forty years ago I 'sat' for an Honours exam and 'took' Plotinus. I 'got a First' all right, but I wish I could have had this book at my elbow. In recent years much work had been done on Plotinus' philosophy, chiefly on the Continent—so much so that Prof Armstrong only says of Dean Inge's two volumes that they are 'still well worth reading'. In a very able Introduction he provides an excellent account of Plotinus' leading ideas. The main part of the book is a series of selections from the *Enneads* in a new translation. They lend themselves readily to this method for they are reports of seminars rather than formal lectures. Plotinus' teaching bases on psychology, though modern psychologists do not use his terms. His influence, under the term 'neo-Platonism', on Christian thought, both theological and mystical, in the long centuries that began with Augustine was, of course, profound. Students of the history of philosophy, both Greek and Christian, will 'bless' the author of this book.

*The Changing Law*, by Sir Alfred Denning (Stevens & Sons, 10s.). The Welfare State has been on the way ever since the Evangelical Revival and has now arrived. The writer of this book, a Lord Justice of Appeal, defines its basis as the doctrine that 'the State should look after those who are unable to look after themselves'. In five lectures he shows how, in face of this doctrine, English Law has changed, is changing, and must further change. For instance, the scope and power of bureaucracy having enormously developed as the instrument of the Welfare State, Law has begun to call it to order. The lectures also deal with Civil Law, the Rights of Women and the Influence of Religion. Under the last, Sir Alfred, after showing how Christian principles have influenced Law in the past, declares his belief that if religion 'goes' now, Law, in any true sense, must 'go' with it, as in Russia. He ends with the Christian plea. I am, of course, a layman in Law, but I have found this book interesting, instructive, and heartening.

*The Preacher's Handbook, Number three*, edited by Greville P. Lewis (The Epworth Press, 8s. 6d.).

*Expository Preaching for Today*, by Andrew W. Blackwood (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, via The Epworth Press, \$3.). 'I have fed you with milk and not with meat', said the Apostle, but Mr Greville Lewis knows that *preachers* need 'meat' and now offers them a third ration of the 'first grade'. There are five 'introductory' studies—e.g. Dr Dorothy

Farrar writes on 'The Preacher's use of the Imagination'. Next there are five expositions suiting different parts of the Christian Year. For example, the Rev. Rupert Davies has six wealthy studies on 'The Cross and the Resurrection'. Every preacher, of course, should preach on these, but many will welcome such help as this in doing so. Finally, a new feature, Dr Snaith furnishes a preacher's 'commentary' on twenty-eight passages in Jeremiah, and the Rev. Kenneth Grayston another on 'Philippians', taking it in seven sections. The names given are proof enough that Mr Lewis has again gathered a strong team. 'More power to his elbow', for there will be many Oliver Twists asking for 'number four'.

In 'many churches (in U.S.A.) today the pulpit contains no Bible, and the minister feels the need of none.' So says the author of the second book, but it bears abundant witness that today Ministers there begin to 'feel the need'. Dr Blackwood has one chapter each on 'structure', 'style', and 'delivery', but five, under different titles, on 'preparation'. Of course the chief point is that to teach the Bible a preacher must first soak himself in it. Dr Blackwood, being a thorough believer in the concrete, gives outlines everywhere from a long series of preachers, and he has illustrations galore. There is one serious omission. There is next to nothing about the expounding of such great Evangelical doctrines as the Atonement. Apart from this, if a preacher wants to preach *from* the Bible to the men of today, this is just the book for him.

*The Preacher and his Greek Testament*, by R. M. L. Waugh (The Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.). 'To teach a science, show 'em *what*; to teach an art, show 'em *how*.' While preaching is much more than an art, it *is* an art. In this book Mr Waugh, by many examples, shows preachers how rewarding it is, taking lexicon and concordance, to discover the full meaning of a single Greek word. 'A word to the wise is enough'—in two senses.

*Asking them Questions*, a Selection, edited by Ronald Selby Wright (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.). Mr Wright has led a 'Boys' Club' of teenagers for many years, and they have asked him many questions, such as 'Who made evil?', 'Why do you believe in God and how can it help you?', 'What do you mean by the Fall of Man?', and 'Why is it wrong to do wrong?' He has asked leading scholars of all Churches to supply answers, and has published three volumes of these. Now he has made a selection from the three. Of course every answerer has his own pre-suppositions, and of course these 'show through'. Mr C. S. Lewis's pre-suppositions, for example, are not those of Father Bull, nor Father D'Arcy's those of Dean Inge. But any competent teacher of the faith to the young will find much help in every answer.

*Greatheart, the Tale of a Country Missionary*, by Harold B. Rattenbury (Cargate Press, 3s. 6d.). I only once met 'Kimber Hill', but, like others, both in China and England, I have always remembered his eyes, for they said: 'This is a man who is very like Jesus—but he doesn't know it.' He had the humility and courtesy of a saint, yet never lost his Yorkshire 'grit' and independence. His life teemed with 'little, nameless *well*-remembered acts of kindness and of love', as manifold spontaneous testimonies, both from China and England, show. He spent thirty-one years in central China. To company with coolies and peasants he would often *walk* fifty miles to 'an appointment', sleeping in Chinese inns or on the road-side, living on fruit and pea-nuts, and taking 'perils of robbers' and worse in his stride. His friend Mr Rattenbury has written very simply, knowing that gold needs no gilding. One finishes the book saying: 'Thank God, there are still saints in the earth.'

*The Conquest of Devil's Island*, by Charles Péan (Max Parrish, 10s. 6d.). In the title of this book 'Devil's Island' is only a symbol, for its subject is the 'Conquest' of the *Bagne*—i.e. of the vast convict system in the whole of French Guiana. In 1928 the French Salvationists at last got leave to send someone to 'see what could be done', and Charles Péan was sent. But it was not until 1933 that permission was finally given to undertake a



mission, and seven Salvationists set out to save the convicts body and soul. They did multitudes of things—for instance, they developed the export of butterflies' wings on the one hand, and, on the other, some of their young men shared the death-in-life of the *libérés*. These were convicts who, having served their term of years in prison, were required to live an equal term in Guiana, earning their own living. As there was next to no employment, this meant that they fell into destitution, filth, despair, and vice. They were worse off than in prison! Meanwhile the Salvation Army in France was urging and urging the Government to abolish the whole system, at length succeeding. In 1952 the last of the victims sailed for home. This is a story of uninterrupted heroism. I wish there were room to give concrete examples. Colonel Péan, who has led the enterprise from the beginning, writes in the simplest way, which brings out the horrors the more. 'What hath God wrought'—through His saints. I have never read a book like this one.

*Missions under the Cross*, edited by Norman Goodall (Edinburgh House, 12s. 6d.). This is 'the official report' of 'Willingen 1952'. It begins with an introduction by the editor entitled: 'Willingen—Milestone, not Terminus.' There follow ten of the Addresses given at the gathering and then fifteen 'Statements and Reports' adopted by it, with a list of delegates, and so on. The unifying theme is 'The Missionary Obligation of the Church'.

*To Introduce the Family*, edited by Ralph Calder (Independent Press, 8s. 6d.). *Congregationalism—Plus*, by Norman Goodall (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.). In order to 'introduce' the Congregationalist Churches of the world to each other, the Rev. Ralph Calder has collected accounts of the various Churches in all the continents which, whether they use the name 'Congregationalist' or not, practice the Congregationalist principles of Church order, government and so on. Dr Goodall's book deals with an allied subject. Dr Berry, the Secretary of the International Congregationalist Council, has inquired from the Overseas Churches founded by Congregationalist missionaries, including those who have united with other Churches, how far they practise Congregationalist principles, and Dr Goodall has deftly gathered the results under 'The Gathered Church', 'The Priesthood of all Believers', 'Confession of Faith', and 'Congregationalism—Sect or Principle'. These results are more than interesting, for undoubtedly Congregationalism has its own contribution to make to the ultimate doctrine and practice of the Church.

*I Turn to Ducks*, by Rita F. Snowden (The Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.). If I were to dare to say that I myself do not very much like Rita Snowden's books, a thousand voices would exclaim: 'Oh, Dr Ryder Smith, how *can* you say so? Rita has helped us *so* much.' Well, my friends, her latest book will help you again. It is called: *I Turn to Ducks*. Can I help being a corn-crake?

*The Gulf of Years*, Letters from John Ruskin to Kathleen Olander, edited by Rayner Urwin (George Allen & Unwin, 9s. 6d.). Late in 1887 Ruskin chanced on a girl student in the National Gallery, named Kathleen Olander, and offered to teach her painting. During the next ten months he wrote her over fifty letters. E. T. Cook declined to use them in his *Life of Ruskin*. She married after Ruskin's death, and his letters were returned to her. She had earlier destroyed six, at two different times, but she has kept the others ever since, and has now written a 'commentary' to accompany them. They are printed *in extenso*. Four things stand out. First, Ruskin's style in writing is amazingly different from that in his books. Then, as with other of his girl devotees, he quickly began to use such words as 'darling' and 'sweet'. Next, the ageing man fell in love with Kathleen, as long before with Rose la Touche, and his letters suggested more and more clearly that they should marry. Last, the girl tried, with some intermittent success, to lead the sin-stricken Ruskin to the Cross. When at last she understood that he was asking her to marry him, she would have consented if she had been left to herself, but her parents blocked the way. On her refusal Ruskin's mind finally failed him. It is a pitiful story.

*Book List*, 1953 (Obtainable from Rev. Prof G. Henton Davies, Melrose, Church St., Houghton-le-Spring, Co, Durham, 5s.). This list contains reviews of the most recent books on the Old Testament in all languages. It has been prepared by Prof H. H. Rowley, and every review is by an expert in its subject. It is superfluous to commend this unique list.

## NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

- Theology Today*, July (Princeton, via B. H. Blackwell, Oxford, 5s.).  
 Mysticism and the Christian Experience, by Otto A. Piper.  
 The Jesus of History and the Christian Faith, by Robert C. Johnson.  
 Charles Williams: Lay Theologian, by R. McAfee Brown.  
 Theological Convictions and Democratic Government, by Winthrop S. Hudson.
- The Journal of Religion*, April (University of Chicago, via Cambridge Press, \$1.75).  
 Interpreting the Christian Faith within (the writer's own) Philosophical Framework, by Bernard E. Meland.  
 Christian Faith and Metaphysics, by Joseph Haroutunian.  
 The Making of the Lay Tradition (in the Puritan Movement), by J. Fulton Maclear.
- do, July  
 Augustine's Earliest Writings, by David E. Roberts.  
 Poetry, Religion, and the Modern Mind (*vis-à-vis* Science), by Nathan A. Scott, Jr.  
 Metaphysics, History, and Civilization: Collingwood's Account of Their Interrelationships, by Julian N. Hartr.
- The Hibbert Journal*, July (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.).  
 The Death Instinct and Western Man, by F. Claude Palmer.  
 Renunciation and Discipline (in the various religions), by A. N. Marlow.  
 The 'Ethic' of Jesus and His 'Theology' (*re* the Great Commandments), by A. C. Fox.  
 And Now the Atomic Clock, by Gérard Poirot.
- The Expository Times*, June (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 6d.).  
 The Person of Christ: Denney's *Jesus and the Gospel*, by J. E. L. Oulton.  
 Christian Belief in a Scientific Age, by William Robinson.  
 The Date (and Order) of Luke-Acts, C. S. C. Williams.
- do, July  
 The Person of Christ: Brunner's *The Mediator*, by J. G. Riddell.  
 The Bridgroom Passage, by Roderic Dunkerley.  
 A Century of Eschatology Discussion (*re* Jesus and Apocalyptic), by G. R. Beasley-Murray.
- do, August  
 The Person of Christ: Thornton's 'The Incarnate Lord', by G. Vaughan Jones.  
 The Gospel of Mark made more Vivid (in recent translations), by Cecil S. Emden.  
 The Rise and Fall of the Little Apocalypse Theory, by G. R. Beasley-Murray.
- The Congregational Quarterly*, July (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.).  
 Man and the State (a challenge to the Churches), by Lord Reith.  
 St Bernard of Clairvaux and his Ideal, by Geoffrey F. Nuttall.  
 A Re-reading of Turgenev, by P. A. Spalding.
- The Ecumenical Review*, July (World Council of Churches, 39 Doughty Street, London, W.C.1, 4s.).  
 Implications of Ecumenical Loyalty (a Challenge), by Leslie E. Cooke.  
 The Relevance of Eschatology for Social Ethics, by Heinz-Dietrich Wendland.  
 Intercommunion at Lund, a Comment and a Proposal, by Daniel Day Williams.  
 Ecumenical Chronicle (from various sources).
- Studies in Philology*, April (North Carolina University Press, via Cambridge Press, \$1.50).  
 Rhetoric and Law in Sixteenth-century England (at the Inns of Court), by R. J. Shoenck.  
 The Case is Altered (Ben Jonson's), by John Jacob Enck.  
 Paeus, the Stuarts, Laud, and Milton (*re* Divine Right of Kings), by George W. Whiting.  
 Recent Literature of the Renaissance, a Bibliography (100 pages), edited by Ernest William Talbert and Others.
- do, July  
 Spenser's Kirkrapine and the Elizabethans (*re* the state of the Church in Spenser's period), by Mother Mary M. Falls.  
 The Digressions in Milton's *Lycidas*, by J. Milton French.  
 Dryden and Boileau—the Question of Critical Influence, by John M. Aden.
- The Yale Review*, Summer (Yale University Press, via Oxford Press, \$1).  
 How Strong is the New Germany?, by Percy W. Bidwell.  
 National Security and Individual Freedom (U.S.A. and Communism), by Robert K. Carr.  
 The Liberal Discovers Big Business, by Peter F. Drucker.  
 Conception, Chile: South American Microcosm, by Cecil Robinson.
- The Harvard Theological Review*, April (Harvard University Press, via Oxford Press, \$1.00).  
 Greek Proverbs in the Gospel (and Apocrypha), by Arnold A. G. Ehrhardt.  
 Marriage Contracts in Ancient Egypt in the Light of Jewish Sources, by Jacob J. Rabinowitz.

# Our Contributors

- JOHN C. BOWMER**  
M.A., B.D. Methodist Minister. Contributor to religious journals.
- HENRY R. CHILLINGWORTH**  
M.A. (DUBLIN) Educated at Cork and at Trin. Coll. Dublin. Studied at the Institut Tilly, Berlin. Assistant Master in English and Irish Schools. Correspondent (for 25 years) of the *Times Ed. Suppl.* Contributor to the *Year Book of Education*, *Hermathena*, *Modern Churchman*, *Irish Times*, and other publications.
- T. J. FOINETTE**  
B.D. Methodist Minister. Graduated at London University.
- CHARLES GIMBLETT**  
M.A. Methodist Minister. Formerly Toynbee Hall Scholar: Trin. Coll. Camb. Moral Sciences Tripos, 2nd Class. Univ. Diploma in Education. S. China (7 years). Author of *Pilot Prayers*. Contributor to various Journals.
- THOMAS EDMUND JESSOP**  
O.B.E., M.C., M.A., LITT.D. Studied at Universities of Leeds and Oxford. 1925-8 Assistant Lecturer in Logic and Metaphysics, Glasgow University. Since 1928 Professor of Philosophy and Psychology in University College of Hull. Author of *Law and Love*, *Evangelism and Education*. *Social Ethics*, etc. Joint editor of *The Works of George Berkeley*.
- W. S. HANDLEY JONES** Poet, essayist, literary critic. Author of *The Unveiling and Other Poems*, *It Crossed My Mind* (a volume of Essays), various pamphlets, and numerous articles in newspapers and reviews.
- JOHN J. LEWIS**  
M.A., B.D. Lecturer in Biblical Languages and Biblical Theology at Trinity Methodist Theological College, Auckland, New Zealand; Part-time lecturer in Hebrew, Auckland University College, 1951; Chaplain to the Auckland Branch of the N.Z. Student Christian Movement
- FREDERICK PILKINGTON** Superintendent Minister of the Newcastle, Staffs (Ebenezer) Circuit; formerly served as Missionary and Chaplain to the Forces. In connexion with the 1953 Campaign broadcast in the BBC Home and Overseas Services on the theme "The Hymns of the Wesleys" in *Wesley's Journal*".
- PERCY SCOTT**  
B.D., D.THEOL. Now Tutor in Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Hartley Victoria College, University of Manchester. Studied in Germany and holds a doctorate at Marburg. In his Circuits a leader in the evangelism of youth.
- T. B. SHEPHERD**  
M.A., PH.D. Senior Lecturer in Education at Westminster Training College. Author of *Living Education*, *Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century*, *Teaching—Begin Here*, *The Noble Art—a Boxing Anthology*.
- C. RYDER SMITH**  
B.A., D.D. Principal, Richmond College, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, London University, 1932-40. President, Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1931. Author of many theological books.

stitut  
res-  
the  
imes,

Coll.  
Edu-  
or to

urer  
ssor  
full,  
hics,

ems,  
and

nity  
ime  
lain  
ent

uit;  
In  
sme  
eya'

bria  
olds  
a of

hor  
nth  
gy.

lon  
ce,

ix,  
era.





## NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

### **CHRISTIANITY, DIPLOMACY AND WAR**

By Herbert Butterfield (*The Beckly Lecture, 1953*)

8s. 6d. net

"And for a simple but complete lesson in Christian realism about politics it is not to be bettered. . . . Professor Butterfield's writing has an astringent clarity about it."—*British Weekly*.

### **THE PRIEST AND THE SIREN** *Literary Studies*

By W. S. Handley Jones.

10s. 6d. net

The author is both poet and philosopher. His felicitous style, together with a deeply reflected knowledge of the era of Chesterton, Wells, Shaw, Bennett, Galsworthy, Lawrence, and the others of whom he writes, enables him to be a guide every bit as charming as he is trustworthy.

### **THE HYMNS OF CHARLES WESLEY** *A Study of their Structure*

By R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.

6s. net

The author here examines the hymns critically yet devotionally, and rewards his readers with many new insights into these amazing, vital songs which helped to sweep England into a better way of life.

### **DOCTRINE AND EVANGELISM**

By Vincent Taylor, Ph.D., D.D.

5s. net

In this book Dr. Taylor examines the Christian doctrines one by one in a simple yet deeply moving and revealing way, and throws light upon all that he touches.

### **HEALING: SPIRITUAL AND OTHER MEANS**

By W. L. Northridge, M.A., M.Th., Ph.D.

1s. 3d.

The subject of spiritual healing has been arousing considerable interest in recent years. To give a balanced view of the whole subject of healing both by material and by non-material means, this small book has been written.

**THE EPWORTH PRESS**

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

## NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

### **QUAKERS AND EDUCATION** As seen in their Schools in England

By W. A. C. Stewart, M.A., Ph.D.

30s. net

A fully integrated account of the outlook of the Society of Friends since the seventeenth century. Teachers and educationists will find much that is absorbing in this treatise.

### **COMMUNION WITH GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT**

By A. Raymond George (*The Fernley-Hartley Lecture, 1953*) 25s. net

"Throughout, the treatment is lucid, calm and frank—qualities doubly welcome in dealing with a subject where confusion, excitability and vagueness sometimes seem deliberate."—Kenneth Grayston in the *Methodist Recorder*.

### **HUGH LATIMER**

By Harold S. Darby

21s. net

"He lives anew—shabby, spectacles swinging from a cord, querulous, even self-pitying, but, suddenly, rising to full stature—in the pages of a remarkable book."—Guy Ramsey in the *Daily Telegraph*.

### **HOW TO BELIEVE**

*The Questions that Challenge Men's Faith answered in the Light of the Apostle's Creed*

By Ralph W. Sockman

10s. 6d. net

What is faith, and what can we reasonably believe? Does it matter what we believe? These and a hundred other questions are answered in this book by America's leading religious broadcaster.

### **THE PREACHER AND HIS GREEK TESTAMENT**

By Richard M. L. Waugh, M.A., B.D.

10s. 6d. net

Many preachers find it impossible to "keep up their Greek" after college days. This book will prove a godsend to many such, affording as it does sidelights upon the Greek which lies behind our New Testament, and it can become a key to the treasures of exact meaning in individual words.

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

